The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 19, Number 5 www.ihr.org September/October 2000



The Zündel 'Human Rights' Hearing
Mark Weber

The Greatest Dirty Open Secret
Arthur R. Butz

Beirut Revisionist Conference Set

Jürgen Graf In Exile in Iran

A Dark Secret of World War II

A Black November for Revisionists
Robert Faurisson

The Rudolf Case, Irving's Libel Suit and the Future of Revisionism
Costas Zaverdinos

Australia Orders Censorship of Revisionist Web Site

— And More —

New!

The Most Important Dissection of the Holocaust Story in Years!

Packed with stunning revelations, this scholarly, attractive and well-referenced work is the best revisionist critique of the Holocaust story to appear in years.



In this big (8 1/2 x 11 inches), illustrated, 600-page collection, 17 specialists — chemists, engineers, geologists, historians and jurists — subject Holocaust claims to withering scrutiny. They expose bogus testimonies, falsified statistics, doctored photos, distorted documents, farcical trials, and technological absurdities. They provide expert examinations of the alleged Holocaust murder weapons: gas vans and gas chambers.

Among the 22 essays in this anthology are:

- Germar Rudolf (E. Gauss), "The Controversy about the Extermination of the Jews.
- Robert Faurisson, Preface and "Witnesses to the Gas Chambers of Auschwitz"
- John C. Ball, "Air Photo Evidence"
- Mark Weber, "'Extermination' Camp Propaganda Myths"
- Friedrich P. Berg, "The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth within a Myth"
- Carlo Mattogno, "The Gas Chambers of Majdanek"
- H. Tiedemann, "Babi Yar: Critical Questions and Comments"
- Udo Walendy, "Do Photographs Prove the NS Extermination of the Jews?"

Writes Dr. Arthur R. Butz: "There is at present no other single volume that so provides a serious reader with a broad understanding of the contemporary state of historical issues that influential people would rather not have examined."

It's no wonder that alarmed authorities banned the original German edition, ordering all remaining copies confiscated and burned.

Dissecting the Holocaust is edited by Germar Rudolf ("Ernst Gauss"), a certified chemist, born in 1964, who wrote "The "Rudolf Report," a detailed on-site forensic examination of the "gas chamber" claims of Auschwitz and Birkenau. After a German court sentenced him to 14 months imprisonment, he fled his homeland and has been living ever since in exile as a political refugee. Since 1997, he has been editor of the German-language historical journal *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*.

DISSECTING THE HOLOCAUST: THE GROWING CRITIQUE OF 'TRUTH' AND MEMORY

Edited by "Ernst Gauss" (Germar Rudolf)
Hardcover. Full color dust jacket. Large-size format. 603 pages.
Photographs. Charts. Source references. Index. (#0319)
$50, plus shipping (Calif. add $3.88 sales tax)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Editor: Mark Weber
Associate Editors: Greg Raven
Theodore J. O'Keefe

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokesmen of
the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D
Los Angeles Unified School District (ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Electrical
and Computer Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Santa Fe Springs, California

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
Professor of French Literature (ret.)
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

JÜRGEN GRAF
Basel, Switzerland

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
Beverly Hills, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

OLEG PLATONOV, Ph.D.
Moscow, Russia

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

GERMAR RUDOLF, Dipl.-Chem.
Hastings, England

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

C. ZAVERDINOS, Ph.D.
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 19, Number 5 September / October 2000

In This Issue

The Importance of the Zündel Hearing in Toronto 2
Mark Weber

Swiss Revisionist Forced Into Exile for Thought Crime 11

Beirut Conference on Revisionism and Zionism 13

Australia Orders Censorship of Töben Web Site 14

German Court Ruling Threatens Internet Freedom 16

The Greatest Dirty Open Secret 18
Arthur R. Butz

A Black November for Revisionists 22
Robert Faurisson

Germar Rudolf Joins *Journal* Advisory Committee 23

Young Germans Resist 'Holocaust Education' 24

'Reductio ad Hitlerum' 24

A Dark Secret of World War II Comes to Light 25

The Rudolf Case, Irving's Libel Suit and the Future of Revisionism 26
Costas Zaverdinos

Letters 62

On the Cover: Germar Rudolf taking a sample from the ruins of morgue *(Leichenkeller)* I of crematory structure *(Krema)* II at Auschwitz-Birkenau, an alleged mass-execution gas chamber.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A. J. P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the **Institute for Historical Review,** P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. Subscription price: $40 per year, $65 for two years, and $90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add $10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add $30 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank. Donations to the IHR are tax-deductible.

Single copies of most *Journal* issues published since Spring 1986 (Volume 7) are available for $7.50 each, plus $2.00 shipping. Ask about the availability of specific issues. Hardbound annual volumes of the *Journal* for the years 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 are also available for $40.00 each, plus $3.50 shipping. Write for our booklist and prices.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on diskette. Send all correspondence to **P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659**. E-mail to: ihr@ihr.org. Web site: http://www.ihr.org.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: $40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

Before the 'Human Rights Tribunal'

The Importance of the Zündel Hearing in Toronto

MARK WEBER

Now into its fifth year, a little-known legal dispute in Canada with important international implications for Internet freedom of speech, is quietly being fought out before the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal in downtown Toronto.

Responding to Jewish complaints, the Canadian Human Rights Commission charges that Ernst Zündel, the controversial German-born Holocaust revisionist publisher and civil rights activist, has been promoting "hatred or contempt" against Jews through the American-based and -operated "Zündelsite" Internet web site. Lined up against him before the Tribunal are lawyers representing Canada's major Jewish organizations, including the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the Canadian Jewish Congress, the Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association, and the League for Human Rights of B'nai B'rith (counterpart of the Anti-Defamation League in the US), along with Sabrina Citron (a Jewish community figure who has pursued Zündel in courts for some 20 years), the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations, and the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Zündel is charged with violating Section 13(1) of the Canadian Human Rights Act, which reads:

> It is a discriminatory practice for a person or a group of persons acting in concert to communicate telephonically or to cause to be so communicated, repeatedly, in whole or in part by means of the facilities of a telecommunication undertaking within the legislative authority of [Canada's] Parliament, any matter that is likely to expose a person of persons to hatred or contempt by reason of the fact that that person or those persons are identifiable on the basis of a prohibited ground for discrimination [that is, by race, ethnicity, religion, and so forth].

This code section, drafted before the Internet was in wide use, was originally meant to prohibit telephone answering machine "hate messages" that callers might access. Given that all of the allegedly offensive Zündelsite Internet postings are *written* communications, it is a stretch to call them "telephonic." In spite of its name, the web site is run by Ingrid Rimland, not Ernst Zündel. Moreover, it has always been based in the United States, and therefore only very dubiously comes "within the legislative authority of [Canada's] Parliament."

Ernst Zündel addresses the 13th IHR Conference, May 28, 2000.

Probably the slippriest term in this "Hate Messages" code section is "likely," because determining what is "likely" to expose someone to "hatred or contempt" is unavoidably subjective.

Zündel is probably best known as the defiantly outspoken defendant in two high-profile "Holocaust trials." For having published an edition of an early revisionist booklet, *Did Six Million Really Die?*, he was charged and brought to trial, defending himself tenaciously in two costly and drawn-out Toronto courtroom battles, 1985 and 1988. In August 1992 Canada's Supreme Court overturned his conviction, declaring the archaic "false news" law under which he had been prosecuted to be unconstitutional. This was therefore not only a vindication for Zündel, but a victory for the rights of all Canadians.

Zündel's main attorney in the current "human rights" case has been Doug Christie, who also ably

represented him in the 1985 and 1988 trials. Working closely with Zündel and Christie has been Barbara Kulaszka, an attorney who was part of the defense team in the 1988 trial, and is the editor/compiler of a valuable 562-page documentary work on that case.

Also on the Zündel side in this case is Paul Fromm, director of the Canadian Association for Free Expression (CAFE), which has been involved as an "intervenor" throughout the Tribunal proceedings. He regards this case an important battle for free speech.

Paul Fromm, Barbara Kulaszka and Doug Christie

Despite its name, the Human Rights Tribunal is not a court. The two persons who preside over the proceedings of this quasi-judicial body, Claude Pensa and Reva Devins, are "Commissioners," not judges, who are appointed by the same federal Human Rights Commission that brought the charge against Zündel. (One of the original Commissioners resigned months ago, reportedly because the proceedings had dragged on so long.) If they find Zündel guilty, they have authority to issue a "cease and desist" order, which would then be registered and enforceable through a Canadian federal court.

This case has been expensive. In addition to the fees for the attorneys of the various Jewish "intervenor" groups in the case, as of late May 1999 the Canadian Human Rights Commission had spent $420,561 of Canadian taxpayers money going after Ernst Zündel. For their role services as Commissioners, Pensa and Devins receive more than $500 per day, plus travel and expenses.

Truth is No Defense

Amazingly, "truth is no defense" in this bizarre proceeding. Neither the truthfulness (factuality) of a "complained of" writing, nor the motive of the writer, may be considered in determining if it is "likely" to expose persons to "hatred or contempt." As Chairman Pensa bluntly put it:

"It is the finding of this Tribunal that truth is not an issue before us. Parliament has spoken. The use of telephone messages for purposes prohibited by section 13 of the Act cannot be justified by asserting that such messages are truthful. The sole issue is whether such communications are likely to expose a person or persons to hatred or contempt." Observes CAFE director Fromm: "This mad hatter's tea party has decided that 'truth is no defense,' that truth doesn't matter. It's only the feelings of the aggrieved minority that determines whether a statement is 'likely' to expose them to hatred or contempt'."

Many of the three dozen "complained of" Zudelsite documents specifically cited by Canadian authorities were not written by Zündel. Several are from the Institute for Historical Review, including Fred Leuchter's essay, "Inside the Auschwitz Gas Chambers," based on his address at the 1989 IHR Conference, Theodore O'Keefe's essay on "The Liberation of the Camps," and two essays by me, "Jewish Soap," from the Summer 1991 IHR *Journal*, and one that has been published for years by the IHR as a leaflet entitled "The Holocaust: Let's Hear Both Sides."

What Jewish groups were unable to achieve through the regular courts in the 1980s, they are now trying to achieve through this quasi-judicial body. They seek to ban writings posted on the Internet that, when published in Canada in printed form, are perfectly legal. Probably the most striking example of this is the booklet *Did Six Million Really Die?*, which Jewish groups and Canadian authorities were unable to criminalize in their costly and drawn-out 1980s legal battle against Zündel. Now this same booklet is the first of the "complained of" documents in this Human Rights Commission action.

With the passage of time, it is ever more difficult, even absurd, to argue that the "complained of" paragraphs from the vast Zündelsite are somehow socially dangerous. During the past two years, Zündel's "case" has become stronger, given that several books and numerous articles and reviews have appeared during this period, both in Canada and in periodicals and web sites around the world, that parallel the supposedly hate-promoting Zündelsite

Ingrid Rimland and Ernst Zündel

documents cited by the Human Rights Commission. In that sense, Ernst Zündel's "sin" is that he is a man ahead of his time.

Probably the most important of these recent writings is *The Holocaust Industry*, a fervent and much-discussed new book by Jewish scholar Norman Finkelstein, a professor at Hunter College in New York City and the son of parents who survived wartime internment in the Warsaw ghetto and German concentration camps. *The Holocaust Industry* (available from the IHR for $23, plus shipping) was accepted as an defense exhibit in the proceedings, and discussed in detail as part of my testimony.

Restrictions on Testimony

As an witness on Zündel's behalf, I experienced first-hand some of the absurdity and hypocrisy of Canada-style "human rights."

I first came before the Tribunal in December 1998, when I was closely questioned to determine if I would be accepted as a witness. After several days of interrogation and argument by the attorneys, Commissioners Pensa and Devins accepted me as an expert witness "in Holocaust revisionism as he [Weber] and others have defined that field," but permitting me to testify "only for the very limited purpose of establishing the context in which the Holocaust revisionist community operates."

I returned to Toronto in early October, nearly two years later, to testify. At the outset of my three days on the stand — October 4-6, 2000 — the two Tribunal Commissioners and the anti-Zündel attorneys made clear that I would be severely, even absurdly, restricted in the scope of my testimony. In his interrogation of me, Doug Christie was obliged to phrase his questions in terms of how a given writing or event was regarded by, or "resonated" within, "the revisionist community." By carefully phrasing his questions to conform to the Tribunal's cumbersome restrictions, he was able to put "on the record" much of what he had intended.

On the first day of my testimony, Christie asked me about Zündel's place in Holocaust revisionism: "What part, to your knowledge of the revisionist field, has Zündel played in revisionism, specifically Holocaust revisionism?"

"Ernst Zündel," I responded, "is not a Holocaust scholar; he is not a historian. He doesn't claim to be a historian. He calls himself an *impresario*. He is a facilitator..." Before I could finish my answer, John Rosen, attorney for the Simon Wiesenthal Center, excitedly jumped to his feet to loudly protest that my answer was "beyond the bounds" of my expertise, and that I am "not entitled to give this evidence. This is an apology for Ernst Zündel."

Commissioner Pensa, apparently accepting Rosen's absurd objection, said to me: "You are not entitled to go into an apologia of Mr. Zündel." I replied by telling Pensa that what I had said is "not an apologia," and went on to explain:

> We [revisionists] regard him [Zündel] as a facilitator, a publicist if you will or, to use his word, an *impresario*. That is not an apology for Ernst Zündel. It is simply a statement of fact of the role that he plays in the [revisionist] community, about which I am quite familiar ... He is not a scholar. He doesn't play the same role in the revisionist community or movement, or whatever you care to call it, that a Robert Faurisson does, or that I do, or that many others do. His motives are different. His goals are different ...

A good part of my testimony was devoted to trying to show that numerous statements in Finkelstein's book, as well as in other widely available periodicals and Internet postings, closely parallel — often in even more strident language — the supposedly "hateful" remarks in the "complained of" Zündelsite documents.

Mark Freiman, attorney for the Human Rights Commission, objected to our efforts to establish this parallel, repeatedly pointing out that the Tribunal had not qualified me as a historian or expert in text and document analysis. (This in spite of the fact that in March 1988 I had testified for five days in Toronto District Court as an expert witness on the "Final Solution" and the Holocaust issue in the second Zündel "Holocaust Trial." [See "My Role in the Zuendel Trial," Winter 1989-90 *Journal*.])

For example, when Christie asked me to compare a passage in *The Holocaust Industry*, with a passage in the revisionist booklet *Did Six Million Really Die?* (one of the "complained of" documents), Freiman objected: "This witness cannot opine as to

the similarity between one text and another text... This witness is not qualified to perform a comparative analysis of texts."

On another occasion Christie asked me "Is Finkelstein the only contemporary source which has repeated the Holocaust revisionist themes?," a question that should have been permissible even within the constraints imposed by the Tribunal, Freiman protested: "I object for the same reason as yesterday, that it calls on the expertise of a historian." On other occasions Freiman similarly objected that I am "not an expert in comparative text or historical analysis," and that I am "not competent to analyze texts, to compare them with other texts, or to comment on history."

Finkelstein's 'Holocaust Industry'

In going through *The Holocaust Industry*, Christie and I highlighted Finkelstein's indictment of the way that organized Jewry has fostered a deceitful and self-serving perception of history. As I repeatedly pointed out, Finkelstein's views echo points that revisionist writers and scholars have made many times over the years. He writes, for example, that given the "nonsense churned out daily by the Holocaust industry, the wonder is that there are so few skeptics..." He also writes:

- "The challenge today is to restore the Nazi holocaust as a rational subject of inquiry."
- "Articulating the key Holocaust dogmas, much of the literature on Hitler's Final Solution is worthless as scholarship. Indeed, the field of Holocaust studies is replete with nonsense, if not sheer fraud."
- "Because ["Holocaust"] survivors are now revered as secular saints, one doesn't dare question them. Preposterous statements pass without comment."
- Israel "invents stories about the Holocaust" in order to "receive more money from Germany and other Western establishments."
- "In recent years, the Holocaust industry has become an outright extortion racket." Finkelstein also refers to "this double shakedown of European countries as well as legitimate Jewish claimants," and to "the Holocaust restitution racket ..."

"The Holocaust," he concludes, "may yet turn out to be the 'greatest robbery in the history of mankind'."

Commenting on one of these passages, I stated:

> It is a startling thing for revisionists that Finkelstein explicitly says what revisionists have emphasized over the years: that Israel and, by extension, others in the organized Jewish community, invent stories about the Holocaust in order to receive more money from Germany and other western establishments.



Mark Weber, John Bennett and Arthur Butz

> This is a point that has been made repeatedly by revisionists over the years. It is startling for revisionists to see a Norman Finkelstein, a professor at Hunter College, affirming that same view as, in fact, he does in this passage.

Another passage from Finkelstein's book that Christie cited was this: "... The Holocaust industry orchestrated a shameless campaign of vilification. With an infinitely compliant and credulous press ready to give banner headlines to any Holocaust-related story, however preposterous, the smear campaign [against Switzerland] proved unstoppable."

Commenting on this, I told the Tribunal:

> The revisionist community has emphasized the incredibly shameless nature of this campaign, and how compliant and credulous the media is in giving banner headlines and credence to claims that later turn out to be completely wrong, completely untrue, not only with regard to the Holocaust campaign but, of course, with regard to all sorts of specific stories about the Second World War and Jewish suffering which also turn out to be untrue, however preposterous, as Finkelstein says. There are numerous examples of that, that I and other revisionists have made over the years, some of which I think appear in the complained of documents [cited by the Commission]. This smear campaign, as Finkelstein says and the revisionist community would agree, has proved unstoppable. The revisionist community has made the point over the years that the willingness of the United States of America and other countries to put up with one amazing humiliation after another carried out by the World Jewish Congress and other Jewish organizations seems boundless.

What Causes Anti-Semitism?

Getting into the emotion-laden question of what causes anti-Jewish sentiment, Christie quoted a passage from Finkelstein's book:

> The shakedown of Switzerland and Germany has been only a prelude to the grand finale: the shakedown of Eastern Europe. With the collapse of the Soviet bloc, alluring prospects opened up in the former heartland of European Jewry. Cloaking itself in the sanctimonious mantle of 'needy Holocaust victims,' the Holocaust industry has sought to extort billions of dollars from these already impoverished countries. Pursuing this end with reckless and ruthless abandon, it has become the main fomenter of anti-Semitism in Europe.

Christie then asked: "Is that in any way related to or echoed in the field of Holocaust revisionist opinion?" Mindful of the constraints imposed by the Tribunal, I replied:

> Holocaust revisionists have very often stressed a similar sentiment, and that is that this extortion, this campaign against Switzerland and Germany, is but one chapter in a campaign that targets many other countries, and there seems to be no end to it. In fact, I think [that] since this book was published, revisionists have been struck that now the first faint signs of a campaign directed against United States institutions also now seems to be in the works.
>
> One of the most striking passages here for revisionists is the final one that you quoted: "Pursuing this end with reckless and ruthless abandon, it has become the main fomenter of anti-Semitism in Europe." This is particularly striking because revisionists have over and over made a statement[s] consistent with this, which is completely at variance with what the Holocaust industry or what Holocaust organizations insist, and that is that anti-Semitism has no relationship whatsoever to what Jews do.
>
> We are told over and over — in our universities, and [in] magazines and newspapers, and by organizations like the Anti-Defamation League and the Simon Wiesenthal Center — that anti-Jewish sentiment is a pathological, inexplicable manifestation of tortured, diseased personalities, and has no relationship to what Jews do. Finkelstein says here that hostility or sentiment against Jews is fomented by actions that Jewish organizations carry out. This gets, I think, really at the core of a lot of what this whole Hearing is about, from the point of view of the revisionist community, and that is: What is the origin of anti-Jewish sentiment in not only this society in North America, but also in any society throughout history?
>
> Revisionists have, over a long period of time and in numerous articles, that have been published in *The Journal of Historical Review* and elsewhere, stressed that there *is* a relationship between anti-Jewish sentiment and what Jews, particularly organized Jewry, do. Revisionists have also strongly stressed that any number of Jewish leaders have on occasion made this same point ...

A short time later I added:

> Revisionists have also stressed on a number of occasions that these campaigns by the World Jewish Congress, by Israel, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and so forth have had the impact, the effect, of increasing anti-Jewish sentiment in Austria, in Switzerland and in other countries. For example, *The Journal of Historical Review* has talked about the increase in anti-Jewish sentiment in Austria after the World Jewish Congress, in a very public way, went after Austria's President, and insisted or demanded that Austrians not elect Kurt Waldheim, so much so that the World Jewish Congress President, Edgar Bronfman, in a [1986] speech in [Montreal] Canada referred to Austrians as "dirty, anti-Semitic dogs." Statements like that, revisionists have pointed out, have the effect of increasing hostility toward Jews in Austria and other countries.

Revisionism and Anti-Semitism

On the relevance of Holocaust revisionism for relations between Jews and non-Jews, I testified that revisionists have repeatedly emphasized

> that historical truth and historical understanding are essential for any kind of tolerant relationship between Jews and every other nationality in our world and that, far from promoting anti-Semitism, Holocaust revisionism should ultimately have the effect of diminishing it; that the alternative is to permit a one-sided, exploitive version of history to take hold in society, and [that] ultimately will have the effect, as Finkelstein suggests in this passage, of increasing hostility toward Jews ...
>
> This is a point that revisionists have also made many times, that this entire Holocaust campaign has the danger certainly, if not the actual import, of harming the interests of "little Jews," or most Jews, or the majority of Jews, and that it benefits only those [Jews] in power and position.

Crossing Swords with Rosen

A high point of my testimony was the cross-examination on Friday, the 6th, by Wiesenthal Center attorney John Rosen, who was every bit at belligerent and arrogant toward me as he had been in December 1998 when I was being qualified as a witness. He repeatedly interrupted my answers to his own questions, rudely demanding that I respond with a one-word "Yes" or "No" answer. At one point he even interrupted me as I was speaking to Tribunal Chairman Pensa. (On at least one occasion Rosen put a question to me in a form that, in keeping with the Tribunal's restrictions, was not permitted to Doug Christie.)

Rosen sought to keep me from testifying as the Tribunal had directed, and as I had sworn to do, giving "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." His outrageous behavior was not merely an insult to me, but to the Tribunal Commissioners who had qualified me as an expert witness to assist them in their deliberations. Nevertheless, Pensa and Devins repeatedly indulged Rosen's rude and insulting behavior, thereby manifesting what seems to be an underlying bias in favor of the anti-Zündel side.

One exchange in particular pointed up Rosen's arrogance, and the Commissioners' indulgence of his bigotry.

> Rosen: "You say, as a revisionist, that there was no Final Solution?"
>
> Weber: "No, I don't say that ..."
>
> Rosen: "Was there a Final Solution?"
>
> Weber: "Excuse me, Mr. Rosen. If I could not be interrupted again ..."
>
> Rosen: "The answer just called for a 'yes' or a 'no,' sir, not a speech, but go ahead."
>
> Weber: "Mr. Pensa...?"
>
> Rosen: "Mr. Pensa, I asked a question that called for a 'yes' or 'no' answer."
>
> Weber: "I would just like it if he would not interrupt me."
>
> Chairperson Pensa: "Do you understand the question?"
>
> Weber: "Yes, and I would like to give my answer, and I don't like to be interrupted."
>
> Pensa: "You should answer the question as responsively and as succinctly as possible."
>
> Weber: "Yes, and I would like it if he would not interrupt me.
>
> In fact, Mr. Rosen [I went on], to the contrary, there *was* a German policy called 'the Final Solution.' I have written extensively about it, [including] in the very document [No. 31] that is in the 'complained of' documents. There is an essay by me which tries to explain the Final Solution policy. It refers to an official German document from the Second World War, a memorandum of the Foreign Office which goes into detail about what the Final Solution policy was. I don't dispute that there was a Final Solution policy. I don't know any revisionist who does ...

Norman Finkelstein

The essay I referred to has been published by the IHR for years as a leaflet, "The Holocaust: Let's Hear Both Sides." It was downloaded by Canadian Human Rights Commission officials from the Zündelsite, who cited as document ("Tab") No. 31 in the official compilation. If Rosen had carefully read through the documents that are at the heart of this dispute, he would have known that I not only describe Germany's wartime "final solution" policy, but to explain it I quote a confidential German Foreign Office memorandum of August 21, 1942 (Nuremberg document NG-2586-J). Rosen's arrogant display of ignorance about the documents at issue in this case suggests that the Simon Wiesenthal Center, which presumably pays him well to represent its interests in these proceedings, is not getting its money's worth from him.

'The Germans'

In another question put to me, Rosen said that "the Nazis — that is, the Germans — during the Second World War executed a plan that was

designed to exterminate Jews who fell under their control..." With some emotion, I responded by saying that the form of this question is itself outrageous, implying as it does that "the Germans" are collectively guilty of mass extermination:

> First of all, the way you put the question in its original form is outrageous. You referred to a plan carried out by "the Germans." This is typical language used by people who are defaming or castigating others, to talk about "the Germans." "The Germans" didn't carry out any execution plan of any kind, Mr. Rosen, and it is wrong to refer to a nationality or a group of people in that way, just as it is wrong to refer to "the Jews" killing people in Palestine, or "the Jews" doing this or that. To put a question in that way is already outrageous.

Seemingly taken aback, Rosen responded by claiming that I had "misquoted" him. "I did not say 'the Germans'; I said 'Germans'," he protested. This was simply not true, as the official transcript proves. Indeed, I had been so struck by Rosen's slanderous reference to "the Germans" that I jotted down his precise words immediately after he uttered them.

The Tribunal, typically, was unperturbed by Rosen's hateful characterization of Germans. (Such anti-German bigotry is so widespread in our society that it routinely passes without objection, or even comment.) Especially given that, as the Tribunal has held, truth and motive may not be considered in determining if a statement is "likely" to promote "hatred or contempt," these words by the Wiesenthal Center attorney violate the spirit of very the law under which the Human Rights Commission was prosecuting Zündel. Rosen's statement, made in this public and official forum, is at least as "likely" to promote "hatred or contempt" for Germans as any Zündelsite statement is to promote "hatred or contempt" for Jews.

'Big Tent' Revisionism

After Rosen's bout, it was Freiman's turn to question me. His main point was to get me to say that Norman Finkelstein is not a Holocaust revisionist. However valid Finkelstein's points may be, he suggested, they should not be compared with the parallel remarks cited in the supposedly hateful Zündelsite documents. I readily acknowledged that Finkelstein apparently accepts the standard Holocaust extermination story, and holds views about specifics of World War II history that differ from those expressed by such revisionists as Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz and myself.

All the same, I defined Holocaust revisionism rather broadly, saying that it includes not only a skeptical or critical look at the role and treatment of Europe's Jews during the Second World War, but also the social, political and cultural impact of those events in society today. On this basis, I said, Finkelstein may "arguably" be regarded as a Holocaust revisionist. Not surprisingly, I pointed, some Jewish critics of his work have denounced him as a Holocaust revisionist or denier. (For example, Rabbi Irving Greenberg, Chairman of the US Holocaust Memorial Council, a US federal government agency, calls Finkelstein's book "a form of Holocaust denial" [New York *Jewish Week*, Sept. 8, 2000].)

Holocaust revisionism, I repeatedly pointed out, is a "big tent" that includes writers, scholars and activists who sometimes disagree among themselves about specific historical issues. In this regard, I mentioned disagreements (aired in this *Journal*) between, for example, Jürgen Graf and Arthur Butz, and between Robert Faurisson and David Irving. I also pointed out that prominent revisionists have, over the years, modified their views about specific issues, in somewhat the way that Raul Hilberg, perhaps the most prominent "establishment" Holocaust historian, has strikingly modified his views over time.

Double Standard

An important early witness against Zündel in this case was Gary D. Prideaux, a Professor of Linguistics at the University of Edmonton. In his testimony about the "complained of" documents downloaded from the Zündelsite, he said that "the epithet 'Holocaust lobby'" is used "to refer to Jews," and that "the term Holocaust lobbyists is used as a negative epithet for Jews."

This is simply not true, as any open-minded person can readily grasp, especially taking into account the entirety of the site's postings. Contrary to the claims of the anti-Zündel side, the "complained of" Zündelsite documents do not attack "Jews, but instead take aim at "the worldwide Holocaust lobby," "Holocaust lobbyists," and "the Jewish lobby — or the Israeli lobby, as some like to call it."

This important distinction is obvious, for example, in one of the allegedly "hateful" passages carefully culled by Canadian officials from the vast Zündelsite. In this "complained of" document ("tab" 22), taken from a March 1997 issue of Zündel's *Power* newsletter, he expresses *concern*, not "hatred or contempt," for the mass of Jews. Zündel writes: "I fear for the 'little Jew' who has no voice and no say in this matter, but ultimately will have to suffer the fallout!"

As was brought out during Christie's examination of me, a number of Jewish writers have made this same point in recent years. In *The Holocaust Industry*, Prof. Finkelstein stresses that major Jew-

ish organizations carry out a "shakedown" that cheats authentic Jewish wartime victims of reparations payments that Jewish leaders have "extorted" in their names.

By the standard that Canadian authorities are applying to Zündel, Internet communications even by established news services should be subject to prosecution. For example, on February 1, 2000, the renowned British news service BBC distributed through the Internet, and without comment, an editorial published the day before in a major Syrian daily paper, *Tishrin*. The editorial, which Jewish groups vehemently denounced as anti-Semitic, told readers:

> ... Zionist organizations are trying, as usual, to revive their own distorted view of history and exploit it in deceiving the world public, winning its sympathy and then blackmailing it ... Zionism has invented the Holocaust myth to blackmail the world and terrorize its intellectuals and statesmen. It is applying the Holocaust method in dealing with the Arabs.

An Orwellian Concept of Rights

Is Canadian society so fragile that an Ernst Zündel can seriously be regarded as a danger to its cohesion or stability? Apparently so. In spite of its Anglo-Saxon heritage of respect for civic rights, fearful Canadian leaders are quietly revoking traditional freedoms. For example, Canadian customs officials regularly (albeit haphazardly) seize "politically incorrect" books, magazines and compact disks at the border. They are confiscated under a code section that bans "hate propaganda," including items "alleging that an identifiable group is racially inferior and/or weaken other segments of society to the detriment of society as a whole," and items "alleging that an identifiable group is manipulating media, trade and finance, government or world politics to the detriment of society as a whole."

Among the items that have been seized by Canadian authorities over the years have been assorted issues of the IHR's *Journal of Historical Review* and various IHR leaflets, as well as such books as *Shockley on Eugenics and Race*, a scholarly anthology by the late Nobel prize laureate William Shockley, *Race, Intelligence and Bias* in Academe, by Roger Pearson, *The Dispossessed Majority*, by Wilmot Robertson, and *The Immigration Invasion*, by Wayne Lutton and John Tanton.

Less understandable have been the seizures of copies of *Advance to Barbarism*, a 50-year-old anti-war classic by British jurist F.J.P. Veale, and *From Moscow to Berlin: Zhukov's Greatest Battles*, the memoir of Soviet World War II General Georgi Zhukov (originally published in the US in 1969 by Harper & Row).

In the Zündel "Human Rights" case, the bias of at least one of the Commissioners is a matter of public record. In April 1999 a Canadian Federal Court found that there existed a reasonable apprehension of bias by Reva Devins because, in 1988, when she was with the Ontario Human Rights Commission, this provincial agency had issued a public statement applauding Zündel's criminal conviction for publishing an edition of the booklet *Did Six Million Really Die?*.

In this landmark case, a coalition of powerful and influential Jewish organizations is using a Canadian government agency, the Orwellian "Human Rights Commission," to censor writings they don't like — writings that are otherwise entirely legal.

The same Jewish groups that demand, in the name of "human rights," that Zündel be silenced, have well-documented records as staunch defenders of, and apologists for, the Zionist regime in Israel that routinely, and as a matter of state policy, oppresses people on the basis of ancestry. Israel's immigration policy, for example, which is based on ancestry criteria that parallel the strictures of Third Reich Germany's infamous 1935 "Nuremberg Laws," even prohibits non-Jews who were born in what is now Israel (including the occupied territories) from returning to their native land.

By any objective standard, these Jewish groups deserve to be in the dock at least as much as does Ernst Zündel. The hypocrisy and gross double standard of this entire case is all the more shameful because it is enforced by a Canadian government agency. Given all this, it's no wonder that Zündel fully expects the Tribunal's Commissioners to issue a sweeping, harshly-worded "cease and desist" order against him.

Ominous Implications

Why are major Jewish organizations devoting so much money and effort to this case? There seem to be three goals:

First, they are forcing Ernst Zündel, whom they hate, to spend a lot of his time and money. Reportedly he has already devoted some $140,000 (Canadian) to defending himself in this case.

Second, Jewish organizations will quickly register a Tribunal "cease and desist" order with a federal court, and then cite any refusal by Zündel to obey it to demand that authorities expel him from the country. (Zündel, who holds German citizenship, lives in Canada as a "landed immigrant," a legal status comparable to that of "permanent resident" in the United States. In the 42 years he has lived in Canada, he has been a peaceful and productive member of society, maintaining an unblemished legal record.)

Third, and probably most important, if Jewish groups succeed in censoring the (USA-based) Zündelsite, they'll be set to have authorities censor every Internet site they don't like in Canada. Jewish groups in other countries could cite the Zündelsite precedent in Canada to demand that authorities ban or censor web sites elsewhere they don't like. If they succeed in banning or censoring an Internet site, Jewish groups would be emboldened to target books, newsletters, newspapers, magazines, videotapes, and even radio and television broadcasts.

Given that this case has far-reaching implications for the rights of all Canadians, it is a shame, as Paul Fromm has pointed out, that the Canadian media has all but ignored it.

Speaking Engagements

My visit to Canada provided an opportunity to address appreciative audiences in two packed meetings. More than 100 persons heard me speak in Toronto, and about 40 were on hand in Kitchener, about 60 miles to the west, with Paul Fromm introducing me on each occasion. Putting the Holocaust "extortion" campaign in historical and social-political context, I spoke about the tremendous power of organized Jewry. (My talk in Canada can be heard online through "Radio Freedom" on the "Freedomsite" http://www.freedomsite.org/r-free. It is also available on audio cassette tape from CAFE, P.O. Box 332, Rexdale, Ont. M9W 5L3, Canada.)

Zündel Concludes His Case

In the weeks after I testified, the Zündel side offered as witnesses for the defense two university professors. Dr. Tony Martin, who teaches African history at Wellesley College in Massachusetts, was to testify on efforts by Jewish groups to silence him, and Dr. Heinz Joachim Klatt, who teaches psychology at Kings College, University of Western Ontario, was set to testify on "political correctness." Commissioners Pensa and Devins rejected both witnesses.

In late November, after a motion to dismiss the case on the grounds that the statute under which it is being prosecuted is unconstitutional, Ernst Zündel abruptly concluded his defense. In his newsletter he cited the Tribunal's bias, the rejection by Canada's Supreme Court of his motions, and the prohibitively high cost off continuing the legal battle. Final arguments in the case are scheduled for February 28, 2001.

NEW!

A Jewish Scholar's Explosive Assault on the Holocaust 'Extortion Racket'

Just who benefits from the seemingly perpetual Holocaust campaign? In this passionate but thoroughly researched and closely argued new book, a American Jewish scholar nails the "Holocaust industry" as a "racket" that serves narrow Jewish interests, above all the interests of Israel and powerful Jewish-Zionist organizations.



"Organized American Jewry has exploited the Nazi holocaust to deflect criticism of Israel's and its own morally indefensible policies," charges author Norman Finkelstein. The Holocaust campaign serves "to deligitimize all criticism of Jews."

This powerful book takes aim at the sanctimonious Elie Wiesel and other Holocaust "secular saints," and debunks such Holocaust hoaxers as Jerzy Kosinksi and Binjamin Wilkomirski. "Given the nonsense churned out daily by the Holocaust industry, the wonder is that there are so few skeptics," writes Finkelstein.

He exposes the "double shakedown" – the extortion by powerful Jewish groups of billions from European countries, and the betrayal by these groups of actual wartime Jewish victims. "In recent years," says Finkelstein, "the Holocaust industry has become an outright extortion racket ... The Holocaust may yet turn out to be the 'greatest robbery in the history of mankind'."

An important book that has already unleashed a heated but serious debate in Europe!

The Holocaust Industry
by Norman G. Finkelstein
Hardcover. Dust jacket. 150 pages.
Source references. (#0520) $ 23, plus shipping

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Jürgen Graf Welcomed in Iran

Swiss Revisionist Forced Into Exile for Thought Crime

A prominent Swiss revisionist author who fled his homeland rather than serve a 15-month prison sentence for "Holocaust denial" has been welcomed in Iran.

Rather than begin serving the politically-motivated prison term that was to commence in October, Jürgen Graf is staying in Tehran at the invitation of a group of Iranian scholars and university professors who are sympathetic to Holocaust revisionism. (Contrary to some reports, he has not been given political asylum in Iran, nor has he requested it.) He has written an 80-page overview of the history and impact of Holocaust revisionism that is being translated into Persian and Arabic for distribution to scholars, journalists and religious and political leaders. Graf will also be giving lectures at Iranian universities. He learning Persian (Farsi) in an intensive study course.

Graf arrived in Tehran on November 17, 2000, concluding a journey that had taken him to Poland, Russia, Ukraine and Turkey. He is impressed with the hospitality and helpfulness of his hosts, as well as with the orderliness, cleanliness and sense of security in the Iranian capital.

At the conclusion of his trial in July 1998, a court in the Swiss town of Baden sentenced Graf to 15 months imprisonment and imposed a heavy fine because of his writings. (See "Swiss Court Punishes Two Revisionists," July-August 1998 *Journal*.)

Graf does not intend to return to Switzerland until normal rights of free speech and free intellectual inquiry are restored. However, he has not yet decided where he will settle and make a new home.

Jürgen Graf, born in 1951, is an educator, researcher and author of several books, including "Holocaust on the Test Stand," which has appeared in more than half a dozen languages. In March 1993, following publication of the 112-page German edition, he was summarily dismissed from his post as a secondary school teacher of Latin and French. (See "Swiss Teacher Suspended for Holocaust Book," Sept.-Oct. 1993 *Journal*.) In December 1994 the French-language edition, *L'Holocauste au scanner*, was banned in France by order of the country's Interior Ministry. Some 200,000 copies of an expanded edition of this work have been published and distributed in Russia under the title "The Myth of the Holocaust." (See "A Major Revisionist Breakthrough in Russia," July-August 1997 *Journal*.)

In recent years Graf has examined the sites of numerous wartime German camps, and has carried out historical research at archives in Poland, Russia, and other countries. (See, for example, "Important Documents Found in Moscow Archives," Nov.-Dec. 1995 *Journal*.) During the coming months he intends to bring out, in collaboration with Carlo Mattogno and Richard Krege, a book about Treblinka, the wartime German camp in Poland where, it is widely alleged, more than 750,000 Jews were killed between July 1942 and April 1943.

Since 1997 Graf has been a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee. His addresses at the Twelfth and 13th IHR Conferences appeared in the Nov.-Dec. 1995 and July-August 2000 *Journal* issues.

In several countries, including Germany, France, Israel, Austria and Switzerland, it is a crime publicly to dispute standard "Holocaust" claims that six million Jews were systematically killed during World War II, most of them in gas chambers. Numerous writers and publishers have been fined or imprisoned for "Holocaust denial." These one-sided "thought crime" laws are the result of a well-organized campaign by the World Jewish Congress and other powerful Jewish organizations.

Jürgen Graf at the 13th IHR Conference, May 28, 2000



Roger Garaudy

Growing Support

Awareness of the importance of the Holocaust story as a key propaganda tool of Israeli-Zionist interests is growing throughout the world, especially in Muslim countries. This was manifest, for example, during the 1998 trial in Paris of the prominent French scholar Roger Garaudy, who was fined $40,000 for his book *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, which presents compelling evidence refuting the orthodox Holocaust story and other historical legends. (An attractive American edition is published by the IHR.)

Religious and political leaders, scholars and journalists in Egypt, Lebanon, Iran and other countries expressed support for Garaudy and Holocaust revisionism. (See T. O'Keefe, "Origin and Enduring Impact of the 'Garaudy Affair'," July-August 1999 *Journal*, pp. 31-35.) A professor at Cairo University, Dr. Amina Rashid, for example, declared: "Zionist propaganda, well entrenched in France, is exploiting the guilt complex among the French for the persecution of the Jews by the Nazis ... The Zionist lobby keeps concentrating on the 'Six Million victims' in spite of the corrections to this figure." In Iran, 600 journalists and 160 members of parliament signed petitions backing Garaudy, and during a visit to the country, he was received by the nation's chief of state, Ayatollah Khamenei, who congratulated the French scholar.

Iran's official radio voice to the world, IRIB, has in recent years expressed support for Holocaust revisionism by broadcasting sympathetic interviews with leading revisionist scholars and activists. Several interviews with IHR Director Mark Weber have been aired on the English-language service, and similar interviews have been broadcast with Ernst Zundel in German and with Ahmed Rami in Arabic. IRIB short-wave radio reaches millions in the Middle East, Europe and Asia.

An editorial, "Myth of the Holocaust," in the English-language Iranian paper *Kayhan International*, Dec. 6, 1999, commented sympathetically on Holocaust revisionism, and criticized German government persecution of Dr. Fredrick Töben and others who dispute Holocaust claims. The paper called Töben an "Australian historian of German origin who is known for his authoritative research on the myth of the Holocaust ... He was jailed and he was fined for having exposed the fabrications of the gas chambers where, Zionist propaganda says, six million Jews perished ..." The paper referred to the "preposterous figure of six million," and praised revisionist scholars for their "courageous research and highlighting of facts of the Second World War."

On May 1, 2000, the Iranian embassy in Vienna granted refuge to an Austrian engineer, Wolfgang Fröhlich, who had been hounded for expressing dissident views on history. At Graf's 1998 trial, Fröhlich had testified that, for technical reasons, mass gassings with Zyklon could not have been carried out in the German wartime camps as alleged. In his request for asylum, he reported that he had been offered $5 million to repudiate his expert testimony in the Graf trial, and instead state that mass killings with Zyklon could somehow have happened as claimed.

Since the Iranian revolution of 1978-79, which overthrew the repressive and pro-Zionist regime of Shah Pahlavi, the Islamic republic has steadfastly opposed Zionist oppression and aggression. United States policy toward Iran has accordingly been hostile, and includes a ban on trade and investment. This belligerent policy, which reflects America's subservience to Zionist interests, is hypocritical. By any objective standard, Iran is today a much more "democratic" state than many with which the US has cordial relations, including Israel, China, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. US efforts to isolate the nation of some 65 million people have been a failure. Reflecting its good relations with the rest of the world (apart from the US and Israel), Iran's popular President, Mohammed Khatami, has in recent years made successful state visits to Italy, France, Germany and Britain.

The warm welcome being given to Jürgen Graf in Iran is not only a dramatic expression of support

for intellectual freedom and human rights, it further refutes the often-made claim that Holocaust revisionism has no significant public or scholarly support.

— M.W., December 23, 2000

International Conference on Revisionism and Zionism Set for Beirut

Prominent scholars, researchers and activists will participate in a landmark international conference on "Revisionism and Zionism" in Beirut, Lebanon, March 31-April 3, 2001. The meeting reflects, and will further strengthen, growing cooperation between revisionist scholars in the West and in Muslim countries.

The event is being organized by the Swiss revisionist organization *Verité et Justice*, in cooperation with the Institute for Historical Review. Conference addresses will be given in Arabic, French and English. Measures have been taken to insure complete security for the event.

Verité et Justice director Jürgen Graf, who was sentenced by a Swiss court in July 1998 to 15 months imprisonment for "Holocaust denial," has fled his homeland to live in political exile rather than serve the politically-motivated sentence. The 49-year-old educator is currently visiting Tehran, Iran, as a guest of scholars.

Guests are welcome to attend the Beirut conference, but they must cover their own travel and hotel expenses. United States citizens traveling to Lebanon require a valid US passport and a visa issued by the Lebanese embassy or a Lebanese consulate.

Updated information is posted on the special "Beirut Conference" section of the IHR web site — http://ihr.org.

— December 26, 2000

"It will be of little avail to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man who knows that the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed?"

— James Madison, *The Federalist,* No. 62

A revisionist classic!

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein

Here is the headline-making university doctoral dissertation that debunks the key "Holocaust" testimony of SS officer Kurt Gerstein — the enigmatic, twisted Third Reich functionary who claimed to have witnessed mass gassings of Jews in 1942. In this closely argued study a French scholar subjects Gerstein's accusations to critical examination, striking at the very roots of the Holocaust extermination story. The stunning conclusion: not only are Gerstein's allegations of mass killings of Jews groundless, but prominent Holocaust historians have deliberately manipulated and falsified key parts of Gerstein's tortured testimony.

Henri Roques

This powerful exposé and its author made world headlines in 1986 when, for the first time in the nearly eight-century history of French universities, a duly awarded doctorate was revoked by government order.

Gerstein's bogus "confessions" were the basis of the anti-German and anti-Catholic hysteria stirred by Rolf Hochhuth's play "The Deputy." Roques' study thus shatters the myth of Pope Pius XII's complicity in Holocaust genocide.

British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper (Lord Dacre) praised this study as "an entirely legitimate, scholarly and responsible work of ***Quellenkritik*** [source critique] on a limited but important subject."

Michel de Bouard of the Institut de France declared: "Had I been a member of the jury, I would probably have given a grade of 'very good' to Mr. Roques' thesis."

Includes transcripts and translations of all six versions of Gerstein's "testimonies," as well as facsimiles of the original texts and other previously unpublished documents and records. Translated from the French by Ronald Percival, who also provides a foreword.

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein
by Henri Roques

Quality softcover. 325 pp. Charts. Index. (#0687)
$7.50, plus $2.50 shipping

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Australia Orders Censorship of Töben Web Site

Jewish Groups Demand Ban on Revisionist Writings

A important legal battle is shaping up in Australia over an effort initiated by Jewish-Zionist groups to ban Internet web site writings that reject standard "Holocaust" extermination claims. In a landmark decision with international implications for freedom of speech, the government has ordered a leading Australian revisionist history resource center to remove from its site material that "denies the Holocaust," and to issue an abject written apology to the country's Jews.

Acting at the behest of Australian Jewry, the country's "Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission" (HREOC) on October 10, 2000, issued its order against the Adelaide Institute, which is headed by Dr. Fredrick Töben. HREOC Commissioner Kathleen McEvoy declared that the Institute had violated Section 18C of the country's 1975 "Racial Discrimination Act" by posting material whose main purpose was to denigrate Jews. The material, "none of which was of a historical, intellectual or scientific standard," she declared, should be banned because it is "bullying, insulting and offensive."

The order came in response to a 1996 complaint by the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), the country's most influential Jewish community organization. Welcoming the order, ECAJ national vice-president Jeremy Jones said that "Toben's Holocaust denial is offensive, insulting and, as HREOC has now confirmed, unlawful." He added: "The Commissioner has demonstrated an understanding of the need to apply laws which cover... the Internet and has also endorsed the view expressed in other jurisdictions that anti-Semitism masking as pseudo-history is as pernicious as more overt forms of racial hatred."

"This is a landmark case," said Peter Wertheim, a Jewish community leader, and ECAJ lawyer in the legal action, "because it deals with hate on the Internet, and it's the first in Australia, and quite possibly anywhere in the world, to have done so."

Consistent with his attitude throughout this legal battle, Töben immediately declared his defiance of the HREOC order, saying that he would not apologize for posting "factually correct material." The only consideration for the HREOC, he noted, is whether Jews were offended by the posted material. "I shall do nothing," he said, "because I consider the proceedings [that led to the order] to have been immoral because truth was not a defense."

Töben has persistently protested the HROEC's standards and procedures. Noting that in such "human rights" cases, the truthfulness or accuracy of the material is not a consideration, he said: "Truth is not a defense. I cannot defend myself against someone's hurt feelings." In September 1997 Töben walked out of a preliminary hearing regarding his publications. "I cannot proceed," he declared, "because if truth is no defense, the lie must prevail. We have an inquisition here." He also withdrew from a public hearing scheduled for December 1997, protesting that he and the Adelaide Institute were being denied "natural justice."

Alan Gold, president of the "anti-defamation unit" of the Jewish-Zionist B'nai B'rith organization commented: "The decision by McEvoy to order the removal of material from the Adelaide Institute's web site is one of the first serious moves to be made against the real menace which the Internet has made possible...Her decision should rightly send shockwaves through the Internet community, to the racists who publish their viewpoints and service providers who allow their businesses to be used by these people." (*Sydney Morning Herald*, Oct. 19)

In early November 2000, the Australia/Israel & Jewish Affairs Council joined the ECAJ in calling on the country's Federal Court to enforce the HREOC censorship order against Töben and the Adelaide Institute. Freedom of speech not an absolute right, argued ECAJ president Nina Bassat. "Hurtful, abusive and incorrect" statements cannot be permitted, she said.

Olga Scully, an associate in Tasmania of the Adelaide Institute, is similarly being targeted by the HREOC and ECAJ. She engaged in "unlawful conduct," the HREOC has declared, by placing anti-Jewish literature in letter boxes and by selling such material at a market. She has been ordered to desist, and to apologize to Jews. The ECAJ has announced plans to bring her case to Federal Court. Scully — a Russian-born 57-year-old grandmother — is not intimidated, and says that she is "quite prepared" to go to prison. "I've lived through worse horrors in my childhood — certainly my family did. A few months or years in jail — that's not going to be any worry to me whatever." Jewish Bolshevik officials killed both of her grandfathers, she says. Fleeing Communism during World War II, her parents

brought her as an infant with her two brothers to Germany in 1943 where, she says, her family was treated with kindness.

Fredrick Töben was born in 1944 in northern Germany, but emigrated with his family to Australia when he was ten. He has lived most of his life in his new homeland, and is an Australian citizen. He studied at universities in Australia, New Zealand and Germany, and holds a Master's degree in education and a Doctorate in philosophy. He has worked as a teacher in Germany, New Zealand, Rhodesia/ Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Australia.

He founded the Adelaide Institute in 1994. Centered in South Australia's largest city, and funded by donations, it plays a major role in the worldwide struggle against the historical blackout through its web site, an informative newsletter, and other activities. It can be reached at P.O. Box 3300, Norwood 5067, Australia. Web site: http://www.adelaideinstitute.org E-mail: info@adelaideinstitute.org

Last year Töben was jailed for seven months in Germany (April-November 1999) for having disputed Holocaust extermination allegations. (See "German Court Sentences Australian Holocaust Skeptic," July-August 1999 *Journal*, pp. 2-5.) He reported on his arrest and imprisonment in his address on May 28, 2000, at the 13th IHR Conference in southern California.

Dr. Fredrick Töben addresses the 13th IHR Conference, May 28, 2000

Standards and Power

Standards for determining just what is "offensive" are, obviously, elastic and subjective. Many people feel "offended" or "insulted" by much of what appears in magazines, books, as well as on the Internet. That's life. If anyone wants to avoid being "offended" by what's on the Adelaide Institute web site, or any other Internet site, he merely has to refrain from viewing the material. Simple.

In practice, only the politically powerful are able to translate their notions of what is "offensive" or "insulting" into law that everyone must obey. No government anywhere has attempted to censor Internet web sites that present a pro-Communist view of history, even though such sites presumably "offend" many victims of Communism. The only serious efforts — so far, anyway — to censor the Internet have, not accidentally, been in response to Jewish complaints.

The laws in various countries that criminalize skepticism of Holocaust extermination claims are the result of a well-organized, long-term Jewish campaign. In 1982 the Institute for Jewish Affairs in London, an agency of the World Jewish Congress, announced that it was launching a worldwide campaign to persuade and pressure governments to outlaw "Holocaust denial" (*Jewish Chronicle* [London], April 23, 1982). The anti-revisionist "thought crime" laws that have subsequently been enacted in several European countries, as well as in Australia, reflect the success of this initiative. Underscoring the organized nature of this campaign, in June 1998 the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists called for new and more severe laws against Holocaust revisionism. ("Jewish Group Demands more Anti-Revisionist Laws," July-August 1998 *Journal*, p. 22.)

In Canada a censorship effort is underway similar to the one against Töben. Acting on a complaint from a Jewish group, a similarly named "Human Rights Commission has called German-born publicist and civil rights activist Ernst Zundel before a "Human Rights Tribunal" in Toronto on charges that material posted on the US-based "Zundelsite" is "likely to expose" Jews to "hatred or contempt." In this case as well, the truth or factuality of the allegedly offensive material is irrelevant.

Australian Voices Against Censorship

The effort to censor the Adelaide Institute is particularly ominous because it comes in a country with a fairly strong tradition of free speech and civil liberties. If Australia's Federal Court upholds the precedent-setting "Human Rights Commission" order banning Internet material, Jewish groups might next seek to censor books, newspapers and

television broadcasts they deem "offensive" or "insulting."

Happily, at least a few voices are speaking out against the effort to censor the Adelaide Institute web site. (These echo the criticisms in 1993 by Australian newspapers and civil liberties groups of a government order banning British historian David Irving from the country. See "Irving Barred From Australia: Major Newspapers and Civil Liberties Groups Denounce Ban Against Historian," May-June 1993 *Journal*, pp. 13-15.)

A leading Australian daily paper, the *Herald Sun* of Melbourne, commented (Nov. 13): "To see how our over-bossy complaints industry can cause more harm than good, check the Executive Council of Australian Jewry's bid to close down the web site of Dr. Fredrick Töben." While calling Töben "a worry," the influential daily warned that the Jewish campaign is only contributing to his "martyrdom." Töben and Adelaide Institute associate Olga Scully, the paper concluded, can "now pose as a victims of a Jewish bid to deny them free speech, and there's sadly just enough truth in that to make them [sic] a real menace."

Terry Lane, a veteran newspaper columnist and television commentator, was more pointed in his criticism. "Are we to take it," wrote Lane in *The Sunday Age* (Melbourne, Oct. 15), "that the human rights commissioner is going to order every outspoken person who offends some group or other to desist and apologize?" Toben's claim about gas chambers, he added, is one that "can be proven or disproved by evidence. It does not need to be censored in advance of the argument ... If Töben is telling the truth, nothing will stop it. If he is a malicious fantasist, then he will be ignored. We should test his assertions, not silence them." (See also Lane's remarkable 1992 commentary, "I Surrender," in the May-June 1993 *Journal*, p. 15.)

Nigel Jackson, an Australian author and civil rights defender, called the HREOC order "a victory of interests over principles." He continued:

> The HREOC can fairly be described as a pseudo-judicial body which was established and entrenched a few decades ago by servile and foolish governments to advance the interests of Jewish pressure groups and other minority ethnic bodies.
>
> Any fair-minded person who studies the publications of the Adelaide Institute over recent years will quickly realize that the HREOC's poorly articulated claim that none of its "Holocaust material" is "of historical, intellectual of scientific standard" is nonsense.
>
> During the last 50 years a significant number of highly intelligent and academically qualified people have cast profound doubt on the received version of "the Holocaust," which was promoted after World War Two and became prominent in the seventies. The simplistic claim (of doubtful veracity) that all "mainstream historians" agree that "the Holocaust" consumed "the lives of six million Jews" will not remove that doubt. It is probably tautologous, the definition of "mainstream" being "those who accept the received version." Historical disagreement of this kind should be dealt with by free and open debate in the intellectual forums of the land and not by appeal from a financially powerful elite to biased commissions or the courts.

For Jewish-Zionist groups, the campaign against "Holocaust" skeptics is nothing less than a war. Thus, WIZO Victoria, an Australian Zionist women's organization, recently sponsored a special "War Against Holocaust Denial" meeting, at which prominent Zionist speakers addressed more than a hundred persons.

The struggle continues.

— *M.W.*

Update

German Court Ruling Threatens Internet Freedom

In an ominous blow against on-line freedom of speech, Germany's highest court declared on December 12, 2000, that German law banning "Holocaust denial" material applies even to foreigners who post such content on Internet web sites outside of the country, as long as the material is accessible in Germany.

The federal supreme court in Karlsruhe, the *Bundesgerichtshof*, was ruling on issues arising from a lower court's verdict against Dr. Fredrick Töben, director of the Adelaide Institute in Australia, for material posted on its web site. Töben was jailed for seven months in Germany (April-November 1999) for having disputed Holocaust extermination allegations. (See "German Court Sentences Australian Holocaust Skeptic," July-August 1999 *Journal*, pp. 2-5.) According to news reports, German authorities are considering asking Australia to extradite Töben to Germany for further prosecution.

With this ruling, Germany is claiming the right to punish citizens of the United States and every other country for posting material on the Internet that is legal in most of the world. Echoing a darker past, the ruling attempts to censor the so far almost entirely unrestricted Internet world wide web. If

other countries, in keeping with the German court's decision, tried to enforce their domestic laws outside their own borders, the result would be international chaos. Internet freedom for dissident views on World War II history is thus an important litmus test for on-line freedom of speech generally.

The German court's ruling could even affect German citizens who post "right-wing" material on the Internet while visiting the United States, warned the *Berliner Zeitung* (Dec. 15).

If the German court's decision were to set an international precedent, the consequences could be bizarre and far-reaching. Americans visiting China could presumably be arrested there if they had ever posted material, even while in the United States, that supports independence for Tibet or calls for an end to Communist rule in China. US citizens who had ever posted material on the Internet supporting social tolerance or equality for homosexuals could be arrested while visiting countries where such views are against the law. Similarly, Americans who had ever posted material supporting discrimination against homosexuals could be arrested while visiting countries where such discrimination is illegal. Americans who have ever posted pornographic material on the Internet could be arrested while visiting countries where pornography is illegal.

"This German court wants to judge over the whole world in effect," commented Andy Mueller-Maguhn, a prominent figure in Germany's Internet scene. The ruling, he added, "seems to be the worst Internet-dependent court decision so far. If other countries would take this as an orientation and start to apply their laws on the citizens of other countries acting in their countries, the worldwide free flow of information could lead very fast to an unfree situation in the real world."

Jewish groups applauded the German court's ruling. "We have to commend the Germans and the French for basically saying 'in our societies, this is how we deal with the problems of hate, racism and Holocaust denial'," said Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles.

German newspapers seemed cautiously supportive of the high court's ruling. Munich's liberal *Süddeutsche Zeitung* praised it as "a small, boldly formulated contribution to combatting socially harmful Internet sites." Web sites such as those of the Adelaide Institute "endanger an important legal value of the Germans, namely peaceful cooperation among population groups." The conservative *Frankfurter Allegemeine Zeitung* questioned whether the Karlsruhe court "may not have gone beyond its means of enforcement. It will be difficult for the federal supreme court to plug this hole with a national penal code."

Ulrich Sieber, a University of Munich professor of criminal law and information law, said that the Karlsruhe court decision "is a courageous step, but it will remain a toothless tiger" because it is difficult to enforce. "The ruling is only significant for people such as Mr. Töben, who are so imprudent as to come to Germany." Extending German penal law to other countries is problematical, says Sieber, because other countries could similarly extend their criminal laws to Germany and elsewhere. "The Internet would then become a dangerous thing, because everyone who posts material on it would have to be concerned that he has thereby broken the law somewhere around the world." The result would be an "informationally impoverished" Internet. "What we need," says Sieber, is a harmonizing of the criminal codes of the various countries. There's no other way to solve the problem."

In a related case, a Paris court in late November ordered the American Internet giant Yahoo to block all French access to sites selling Nazi memorabilia. The case had been brought by three Jewish and "anti-racist" groups, who said that sites accessed through Yahoo violated French laws against "hate" publications and the sale of racially offensive material. In its defense Yahoo argued that it would be impossible to bar only French users, as US-based sites are accessed by people around the world. The French court gave Yahoo three months to comply with its ruling, or face hefty fines of more than $10,000 per day.

In late October a German court found a 36-year-old man guilty on four counts of "popular incitement" (*Volksverhetzung*) for having posted from his apartment in Zurich, Switzerland, on a Jewish web site a text that "denied the genocide of the Jews" in World War II. The court in Freiburg imposed a fine of 3,000 marks and a six month prison sentence (suspended), and ordered the seizure of the defendant's computer. The defendant acknowledged that in material posted on the discussion forum of the "haGalil" web site, which promotes Jewish interests in Europe, he had cited various sources to dispute the familiar figure of six million Jewish wartime dead, and had questioned, on technical grounds, the familiar claims of mass killings of Jews in wartime gas chambers using the commercial pesticide Zyklon B. He had hoped, he said, to thereby promote a healthy discussion of historical issues. (Sources: "Haftstrafe als Prävention," *Badische Zeitung*, Oct. 21; "Im Internet gegen den Holocaust polemisiert," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, Oct. 23).

"To you insane world
But one reply — I refuse."
— Marina Tsvetaeva, Russian poet (1892-1941)

The Greatest Dirty Open Secret

Arthur R. Butz

In the trials and tribulations of Fredrick Töben one can observe in operation the greatest dirty open secret of our day. In explaining that remark here, I will do my best to be objective, despite the fact that because of the conditions I am to discuss several of my friends have been imprisoned or fined for doing the sorts of things I also do.

In October 1997 I received a request from Töben, director of the Adelaide Institute and a Holocaust revisionist, to be a defense witness for him in his hearings before the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC). The role would have involved writing a letter for him and perhaps testifying by telephone from my home near Chicago.

I resisted this request, pleading a shortage of time and the fact that he had told me, earlier that year in Chicago, that the Australian "Human Rights" legislation has no teeth and that he did not have to pay any attention to such proceedings against him. Both pleas were true but I had another strong reason for my reticence, which was too complicated to state in these rapid-fire e-mail messages, but which can be explained here in due course.

In any case I relented after a few passionate e-mails from Töben. I wrote a two page letter, intended to be submitted to the HREOC hearings. The letter, dated November 5, declared:

> Alas I must say that you are arguably guilty of some of the charges. I looked over Jeremy Jones' stuff and I infer that the "Racial Discrimination Act" proscribes what might "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate another person or group of people." Well, revisionism certainly does the first three! It does not however "intimidate"; at least, I have never noticed such a case ... Heated *controversy* is a price of open debate, the foundation of a rational society.

Jeremy Jones was the representative of the Jewish organization that had brought charges against Töben. I commented on Jones' letter by declaring Töben guilty. Some defense witness!

Far from acting betrayed by me, Töben submitted the letter to the HREOC. I believe that he was starting to see my real reason for reluctance to get involved as a defense witness. Such matters as I had expertise in were irrelevant to the proceedings, which related not to historical truth, but to offending, insulting, etc.. For the most part I could not understand the notion of culpability as used in the proceedings, but to the extent that I could understand, Töben was guilty. I am at least as guilty, as are many of my revisionist friends. The situation was structured such that nothing I could have said would have helped attain a favorable verdict, as became clear to Töben shortly later.

On December 7 Töben ended his participation in the hearings, complaining that he was unable to defend the position of the Adelaide Institute because the HREOC was not interested in historical truth. The breaking point seems to have come when the Commission rejected the witness statement of Dr. Robert Faurisson as "irrelevant."[1] In a hearing conducted by telephone on November 27, the Commission had told Töben that for the most part the witness statements he had submitted had to be disqualified either because (1) they "make comments about the desirability, validity, constitutionality or sensibleness of this law" under which the hearings were being held or (2) they comment on "the substance" of the historical problem, that is, "the truth of the Holocaust, the extent of the Holocaust, its existence" which "is not of much significance" for the hearings.[2]

Of course these two questions are, to our common sense (or as Töben puts it our sense of "natural justice"), the only relevant questions. There is almost nothing left to be said if these two questions are excluded. I felt vindicated, because even the

---

Arthur R. Butz was born and raised in New York City. In 1965 he received his doctorate in Control Sciences from the University of Minnesota. In 1966 he joined the faculty of Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois), where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering. In addition to numerous technical papers, Dr. Butz is the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.*

This essay, which will soon appear as the introduction to Fredrick Töben's forthcoming book, *Where Truth is No Defence: I Want to Break Free*, is also posted on the Adelaide Institute web site: www.adelaideinstitute.org.

accused had decided to submit no defense. I could not be accused of failing him. Faurisson had written one of his usual masterfully incisive analyses of the historical problems, formulated for the layman, and his statement was rejected. The implicit effect of what I wrote was to question the law itself, but I declared Töben guilty so my statement was accepted. We may make the basic observation that it was impossible to determine what Töben was being charged with, apart from saying things that annoyed some people. The commission was not interested in the intentions behind Töben's public declarations, or in their actual effect.

This observation raises the general question of the legal formulations under which Holocaust revisionists are persecuted in various countries. For purposes of such a discussion, we can take two: the "Human Rights Act" (such an Orwellian term!) in Canada and the 1990 Fabius-Gayssot law in France.

These two legislations do contrast sharply, but in practice they operate similarly, as I now explain.

In the Canadian case, the code excludes the relevance of three considerations:

1. The truth of the offending statements.
2. The intent behind the expression of the statements, for example, whether they were intended to cause people to hate Jews.
3. The actual effect of the statements, for example, whether they caused people to hate Jews, whatever the intent of the author.

We simple minded people will scratch our heads and wonder what is left to try. It is this: whether the statements "exposed" somebody to hatred or contempt.

It is impossible for me to clarify that standard because, to the extent I understand it, reference is being made to a condition into which all of us are born. Somebody may start hating us, and often does. Holocaust revisionists are hated more than most, but exposure to hatred is basically part of the human condition. One can be argued to be innocent of such an offense only in that sense, that is, that the condition referred to is a condition we are all in, independently of what statements are made by anybody. If that plea is unacceptable, then of course we are all guilty. Anybody may be hated in the future for all sorts of reasons. Witness human history.

By contrast, the French Fabius-Gayssot law is very clear. It proscribes contesting the truth of any finding in the "Crimes Against Humanity" section of the 1946 judgment in the main Nuremberg trial. It candidly expresses, without any tergiversation, what all legal moves against revisionists are trying to do: freeze received history in the state of the end of war hysteria of 1945-1946. This sort of law contrasts with the typical "human rights" legislation, since here there is no doubt what offense an accused is being charged with.



Arthur Butz at the 13th IHR Conference, May 27-29, 2000.

The Australian statute resembles the Canadian, and the formulation of the French law is approximated in Germany, with its "denial of established fact" clause. These are two starkly contrasting formulations, and Töben may be unique in having been prosecuted under both, for as this book relates at length, in April 1999 he was jailed in Germany while traveling there.

That the two formulations have something important in common is suggested by what finally happened when Töben's trial came up in Germany in November 1999. Again, he decided to remain silent and offer no defense, and his lawyer did likewise. I commented on my web site:[3]

> If I must conjecture the specific grounds for Töben's silence during the trial, I would guess that his protest is based on the impossibility of arguing the truth of any of the claims he has made, for which he is being prosecuted. I suppose in the court's eyes there is a certain amount of logic in that situation which, as so often happens, makes legal sense but not common sense. If, for example, there were a law outlawing the denial that Germany is on the planet Mars, and if I deny that Germany is on

> the planet Mars and am prosecuted for the claim, then the question of whether Germany is on the planet Mars is irrelevant to the question of whether I broke the law. Truth is no defense. In those circumstances I would adopt the strategy Töben adopted, silence, which for me would make both legal sense and common sense.

Thus the two contrasting formulations confront the accused revisionist with the same practical situation: the impossibility of seeking to justify the offending statements in relation to the accusations. Before a "Human Rights" tribunal, a Holocaust revisionist confronts unintelligible accusations. Under the French or German laws, the Holocaust revisionist is accused of being a Holocaust revisionist. If I had been a defense witness for Töben in Germany, I could not have helped him and indeed he could not think of anything to help himself. There was nothing for him to say, and nothing a defense witness could have effectively said in his support. Such court victories as revisionist defendants have won have been based on legal and constitutional technicalities.

Since western society has, for many years, made freedom of expression one of its highest values, the reactions of the civil liberties groups to this offensive and scandalous situation are of great interest.

Their reactions are equally offensive and even more scandalous. The leading (in terms of general prestige) international civil rights group is Amnesty International, headquartered in London. Amnesty has a designation, "prisoner of conscience," which it describes thus:[4]

> "Prisoners of conscience" is the original term given by the founders of Amnesty International to people who are imprisoned, detained or otherwise physically restricted anywhere because of their beliefs, color, sex, ethnic origin, language or religion, provided they have not used or advocated violence.
>
> The concept of a prisoner of conscience transcends class, creed, color or geography and reflects the basic principle on which Amnesty International was founded: that all people have the right to express their convictions and the obligation to extend that freedom to others. The imprisonment of individuals because of their beliefs or origins is a violation of fundamental human rights; rights which are not privileges "bestowed" on individuals by states and which, therefore, cannot be withdrawn for political convenience.
>
> Amnesty International seeks the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of conscience.

Early in Töben's German incarceration John Bennett, the Melbourne civil liberties lawyer, wrote to Amnesty to request them to formally adopt Töben as a "prisoner of conscience" which, in ordinary meaning, is what he was. In a long letter Amnesty declined, declaring that

> in 1995 the organization decided at a meeting of its International Council — the highest decision making body of Amnesty International — that it would exclude from prisoner of conscience status not only people who have used or advocated violence, but also people who are imprisoned "for having advocated national, racial, or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence." The decision codified Amnesty International's intention to exclude from prisoner of conscience status those who advocate the denial of the Holocaust and it confirmed what had in fact had been the de facto interpretation of the prisoner of conscience definition contained in Article 1 of Amnesty International's Statute.

That seems to say that "those who advocate the denial of the Holocaust" are viewed by Amnesty as thereby advocating "national, racial, or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence." That is rubbish, an obvious logical *non sequitur*, empirically contradicted by easy observation; I have never seen such advocacy in the Adelaide Institute newsletter. It is such obvious rubbish that it must be called a lie. Töben is not in the class of an Elie Wiesel, who has incited hatred of Germans, or of Zionists who have incited discrimination and violence against Arabs.

Amnesty has declined to support freedom of expression for Holocaust revisionists for political reasons. It is, therefore, not worthy of respect.

The organization's hypocrisy is highlighted by the case of Nelson Mandela, who during his sabotage trial in South Africa in 1964, admitted that he believed in violence to achieve his political objectives and for that purpose had been a leader of a campaign of sabotage. Mandela was a hot subject of debate at Amnesty's meeting in September 1964 because, while the overwhelming sentiment was to continue to support him, one of the rules pertaining to the prisoner of conscience category was that those who used or advocated violence were not eligible. Thus the meeting decided against adopting Mandela thus, but it also voted for supporting him anyway.[5] A mere label was withheld, not the support. Töben needed the support more than the label.

Thus we see in the Töben case hypocrisy at high levels of contemporary public life, but I opened by promising "the greatest dirty open secret of our day,"

and I have yet to explain.

Like the study of taboos, the study of hypocritical exceptions to agreed norms is highly instructive on the real, as opposed to declared, values of a society. That free expression of ideas must be a fundamental value of the sort of society we purport to be has virtual unanimous support, at least in the abstract. True, the ideal of free expression must be qualified in various ways, for example by national security laws and restrictions against distribution of pornography in some circumstances. However it is hard to make even a bad case for censorship of the history of the remote past unless that history impacts in some way on the present; in such event bad cases can be and are made.

The past and the present are linked, in the case of Holocaust revisionism, by Zionism. Many Israeli leaders agree that the Holocaust is "what this country's all about."[6] That statement is more true than the speaker intended, because apart from Zionism's obvious contemporary exploitation of the Holocaust legend, there is the lesser known role that Zionism played in establishing, during the years 1942-1948, the legend that was to become its life blood, as I have discussed at length elsewhere. However even that is not the "greatest dirty open secret of our day."

It is widely imagined that the various national-socialist movements that flourished in Europe more than 50 years ago are dead, but that is not true. Yes, gone are not only Hitler's Nazis and Mussolini's Fascists, but also the British Union of Fascists, the Croatian Ustashe, the Hungarian Arrow Cross, the Romanian Iron Guard, the Parti Populaire Français, and all such national-socialist movements except Zionism, a movement born and nurtured in Europe during the heyday of nationalism and socialism, and which is quite vigorous today. Its *völkisch* principle, that of the "chosen people," is the oldest and best tested extant.

Despite occasional rhetoric by various governments and organizations like Amnesty International, for example against torture of prisoners, Israel and thus Zionism are essentially untouchable in international affairs. One cannot imagine, for example, Israel being treated harshly for defying UN resolutions, even with measures less severe than those used against Iraq during the past decade. Our institutions not only support Israel as a state, they also support Zionism in domestic policy by means tailored for each country. In Europe critical examination of Zionism's sustaining legend is outlawed.

That is not the case in the USA, for constitutional reasons, but US institutions look kindly on this European repression nevertheless. There are occasional references in the US press to the European anti-revisionist laws, but I have never seen an editorial condemnation of them from these editors who so righteously scold China for its human rights violations. A frightening episode occurred in 1993 and 1994, when FBI Director Louis Freeh held talks with the German *Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz* (Federal Office for Protection of the Constitution), the euphemistically named agency that performs many of the functions once entrusted to the more honestly named *Geheime Staatspolizei* (Gestapo or Secret State Police). The talks sought to find ways the US could stop the flow, from the USA to Germany, of literature banned by German law but lawful in the USA.[7] The talks seem to have come to nothing but the point was clearly made that the USA approves of such German repression of civil liberties. The role of the USA in supporting Israel diplomatically, financially and militarily is well known. The USA is also the mainstay of the operation of the related Holocaust restitution racket.

Thus the institutions of some major Western countries, flouting established legal and ethical norms, are as intellectually repressive as anybody's Gestapo, in enforcing service to the only surviving European national-socialist movement, and the others are tacitly or even openly supportive of that repression. That is the greatest dirty open secret of our day.

— September 2000

Notes

1. Adelaide Institute newsletter, Jan. 1998, pp. 1, 8.
2. Adelaide Institute newsletter, Feb. 1998, p. 10.
3. http://pubweb.nwu.edu/~abutz
4. *Prisoners of Conscience* (London: Amnesty International Publications, 1981), pp. 1-2.
5. Egon Larsen, *A Flame in Barbed Wire* (London: Frederick Muller, 1978; New York: W.W. Norton: 1979).
6. Efraim Zuroff, Israel director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, quoted in the *New York Times*, Jan. 14, 1995, p. 6.
7. *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 15, 1993, sec. 1, pp. 1,16; Dec. 19, 1993, sec. 1, p. 4; June 27, 1994, sec. 1, p. 4. Publicly the talk was about stopping "neo-Nazi" propaganda, but that is a common camouflage or package term when Holocaust revisionism is a target that it would be inexpedient to identify.

"The historian is not trying the men and women of the past; he is contemplating them; he has to see them as in truth they were and to present them as such to others, and a man, as a man, cannot be seen truly unless his moral worth, his loveworthiness, is seen."

— David Knowles, *The Historian and Character, and Other Essays*. Quoted in Thomas C. Reeves, *A Question of Character* (1992), p. vii.

A Black November for Revisionists

Robert Faurisson

On November 1, 2000, French historian and sociologist Serge Thion, 58 and a father of three, was dismissed from the *Centre national de la recherche scientifique* (CNRS), without salary or severance pay. [Thion is the author of numerous scholarly articles and several books, including *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?*, a collection of revisionist essays published in Paris in 1980. He is also a contributor to this *Journal*.]

On November 6, the University of Lyon 2 began proceedings against Jean Plantin, 35, to revoke his *diplôme d'études approfondies* (DEA, "advanced studies degree"), obtained in 1991. France's Education Minister, Jack Lang, will make the final decision in the matter. (Lang, who is Jewish and a major Socialist party figure, has been a promoter, along with Laurent Fabius, also Jewish, of the anti-revisionist "Fabius-Gayssot law" of July 13, 1990.) On November 24 the teaching staff of the history department of the University of Lyon 3 let it be known that they are in favor of an identical course of action that, they hope, will strip Plantin of the master's degree conferred by their faculty in 1990. [Plantin is editor of the scholarly revisionist journal *Akribeia*, and director of a small publishing center of the same name, which has issued French editions of several revisionist works, including Arthur Ponsonby's *Falsehood in Wartime* and, most recently, Ralph Keeling's *Gruesome Harvest*. See "Scholarly French Journal Strives for 'Exactitude'," Nov.-Dec. 1998 *Journal*.]

On November 17, Vincent Reynouard, a 31-year-old father of three small children, was dismissed from his position as a teacher of mathematics and science. Having been forced to leave a similar job at a state secondary school, he had just obtained this position in a Roman Catholic establishment run by a priest. Certain colleagues, who had heard his name on the "France-Culture" radio network, were either alarmed or angered by his presence among them. They all demanded that he be sacked.

On November 20, the Paris *tribunal de grande instance* ("high court") ordered the director of the giant American Internet firm Yahoo! to impose several forms of censorship in France and, in particular, to remove from its search engines links to revisionist web sites.

Outside of France as well, repression against revisionists is growing steadily more severe. In Germany on May 23, Münster university professor Werner Pfeifenberger was driven to suicide. [See "German Professor, Accused of Revisionism, Commits Suicide," May-June 2000 *Journal*.] Also in Münster, Erhard Kemper, age 73, is once again in prison. His request for leave to go to the bedside of his wife, who is terminally ill with cancer and almost completely immobilized, was rejected on November 24 by unanimous decision of the judges.

Udo Walendy, 73, has been in prison for 28 months for having published dissident historical writings on the Holocaust issue. His request for normal release upon serving two-thirds of his sentence was recently rejected on the grounds that he is unlikely to change his views on history. Walendy suffers from a serious eye ailment. [See "Dissident German Historian Punished for Revisionist Writings," July-August 1998 *Journal*.]

In France, Henri Lewcowicz, who is half-Jewish, said in a radio talk show broadcast with Jean-Marie Le Pen that the Nazi gas chambers are a hoax. On September 7 in Paris, he was sentenced to, among other things, undergo a psychiatric examination that could lead to mandatory hospitalization.

On December 4, Jean-Louis Berger, a teacher of French and Latin at a secondary school near Metz (Lorraine), 55 years of age and the father of three, appeared before a disciplinary board. He will likely be expelled from the teaching profession, without salary or severance pay.

In Austria, Switzerland, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, the hunt for revisionists is intensifying.

In the mainstream media, not a single voice is raised in defense of the persecuted.

Last minute news: On December 8 the Internet servers for the revisionist web sites "Radio Islam" (which receives some 90,000 visits per day) and "aaargh" (with about 7,000 visits per day) has definitively shut down the two sites. It will be some time before new addresses are known.

In Paris a 35-year-old man has been arrested for putting on the Internet allegedly anti-Jewish, and probably revisionist, material. His arrest was made possible through a recently created French police agency, the *Brigade des affaires sanitaires et des libertés publiques* (BASLP, "Health Affairs and Public Liberties Brigade"). The French Interior Ministry bureau responsible for censorship is called the

"Public Liberties Office." (*Le Journal du dimanche*, Dec. 10, 2000)

In Nantes a teacher has been suspended for revisionism. (Details about the case, including the teacher's name, are not yet known.)

I cannot recommend strongly enough that those who have the means to do so come to the financial aid of any of the four latest French victims of anti-revisionist repression:

• Jean-Louis Berger, 146, Rue de Leitzelthal, 57230 Philippsbourg, France

• Jean Plantin, 45/3, Route de Vourles, 69230 St. Genis Laval, France

• Vincent Reynouard, 107, Chaussée de Vleurgatt, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

• Serge Thion, 1, Aubray, 91780 Chalo Saint Mars, France

— December 13, 2000

Germar Rudolf Joins *Journal* Advisory Committee

We are pleased to welcome Germar Rudolf, a leading revisionist writer and activist, as a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee. He is perhaps best known as the author of *The Rudolf Report,* a detailed 1993 forensic study based on an on-site investigation, chemical analysis of samples and meticulous research, which concludes that the "gas chambers" at Auschwitz, including Birkenau, were never used to kill prisoners as alleged. (An English-language summary edition is available through the IHR for $5.99, plus shipping.) For the past four years, the 36-year-old German-born chemist has been forced to live in exile after a German court sentenced him to a prison term for expressing dissident views on history.

Rudolf was born on October 29, 1964, in Limburg/Lahm, Germany. After completing studies — *summa cum laude* — in chemistry at the University of Bonn, 1983-1989, he received certification as a chemist (Dipl.-Chem.). He then served with the German air force, 1989-1990.

In the Winter of 1990-91, while working toward a doctorate in chemistry at the renowned Max Planck Institute for Solid State Physics in Stuttgart (Oct. 1990-June 1993), he began a scientific investigation of the credibility of the *Leuchter Report*, a 1988 forensic examination by American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter of the alleged mass execution gas chambers of Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek (Lublin). Rudolf's "Technical Report on the Formation and Detectability of Cyanide Compounds in the 'Gas Chamber' of Auschwitz," first published in January 1992, corroborates and strengthens the findings of earlier forensic investigations of purported Auschwitz "gas chambers." (For more on *The Rudolf Report*, see the Nov.-Dec. 1993 *Journal*, pp. 25-26, and the Nov.-Dec. 1994 *Journal*, pp. 14-15.)

Following predictable protests from Jewish community leaders, he was fired from his position with the Max Planck Institute. Similarly, the University of Stuttgart rejected, on political grounds, his doctoral dissertation, in spite of laudatory recommendations.

Germar Rudolf addresses the 13th IHR Conference in southern California, May 29, 2000.

A Stuttgart court declared that the *Rudolf Report* constitutes "denial of the systematic mass murder of the Jewish population in gas chambers," and therefore violates German laws against "popular incitement," "incitement to racial hatred," and "defamation." The judge in the case called Rudolf an anti-Semite who is "fanatically committed" to "denying the Holocaust." The court rejected Rudolf's request for evidence and expert testimony on the gas chamber issue because, it declared, "the mass murder of the Jews" is "obvious" (*offenkundig*).

German authorities also went after Rudolf for his role in writing and editing *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, a revisionist anthology. (For more on this, see the May-June 1995 *Journal*, p. 43.) In 1996 a court fined the publisher 30,000 marks (about $18,000), and ordered all remaining *Grundlagen* copies to be seized and burned.

While he was still living in Germany, police car-

ried out raids on his residence in 1993, 1994 and 1995, and on two occasions he and his family were evicted from their apartment, in each case when his wife was pregnant. After a German court sentenced him to 14 months imprisonment, Rudolf fled the country in 1996 to avoid serving the politically motivated sentence.

Since 1997 he has been director of Castle Hill Publishers in Britain (P.O. Box 118, Hastings, England TN34 3ZQ, UK), which has issued several important revisionist works, as well as editor-publisher of the scholarly revisionist journal *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*. (See "Important New German-Language Revisionist Quarterly," May-June 1998 *Journal*, pp. 26 ff.)

Since October 1999, a sensational British media campaign has targeted Rudolf as a "neo-Nazi fugitive," with British authorities reportedly seeking to extradite him to Germany. (He is emphatically not a "neo-Nazi.") The campaign also prompted new calls, above all by Jewish groups, for a British law to criminalize "Holocaust denial" similar to those in Germany, France, Switzerland and other European countries. Rudolf's legal status in Britain is unclear because he has done nothing illegal under British law.

Rudolf has worked together with the Foundation for Free Historical Research, or Vrij Historish Onderzoek (VHO), based in Flanders, Belgium. (See the VHO web site http://www.vho.org, and "A Belgian Foundation Battles for Free Speech," Jan.-Feb. 1996 *Journal*, p. 46.)

Rudolf is the editor of or contributor to several important revisionist anthologies, including *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* (1993) and *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (1994), both published by Grabert in Tübingen under the pen name of Ernst Gauss, as well as *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten* (1995), and *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte* (1996), each nominally edited by H. Verbeke, and published in Belgium by VHO. Rudolf's most recent publication is an impressive 603-page English-language anthology, *Dissecting the Holocaust* (available from the IHR for $50).

He was married in 1994, and has two young children, but amid the turmoil and difficulties of living in exile, his marriage has fallen apart. He addressed the 13th IHR Conference, May 27-29, 2000. Speaking with authority based on bitter personal experience, he dealt with the legal repression of dissidents in Germany.

For more about Rudolf, see the detailed article by Dr. Costas Zaverdinos in this *Journal* issue, as well as the information posted on the VHO web site: http://www.vho.org/Authors/Germar_RudolfE.html E-mail reaches Rudolf at: chp@vho.org

— *M.W.*

Young Germans Resist 'Holocaust Education'

No country, with the possible exception of the United States, has been so massively subjected to "Holocaustomania" as Germany. The campaign includes mandatory "Holocaust education" in schools, extensive treatment on television and in newspapers and magazines, "Holocaust"-theme motion pictures, and formal government ceremonies and solemn pronouncements by public figures. But this costly, seemingly endless effort doesn't seem to be paying off, especially in shaping the attitudes of younger people.

Two-thirds of Germans aged 14 to 18 do not even know what the term "Holocaust" means, according to a new "Emnid" public opinion survey cited recently by a member of the Baden-Württemberg provincial legislature. Moreover, 20 percent of Germans youths are unfamiliar with the term "Auschwitz." ("Aufklärung über NS-Zeit verbessern," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, No. 190, Aug. 18, 2000.)

A clear majority of young Germans sureyed — 62 percent — oppose punishing persons who "deny the Holocaust." (In Germany, as in several other European countries, "Holocaust denial" is a crime.)

As a result of all this, lamented SPD legislator Norbert Zeller, many teenagers don't regard the events of the Holocaust as objectionable. To counter this, he went on to declare, German schools should deal even more intensively with the "Holocaust."

'Reductio ad Hitlerum'

"The propagators of the new religion of the holocaust are not actually interested in the sufferings of the Jews but in the destruction of every good thing that can be tarred with the Nazi brush: Lutheran and Catholic Christianity, patriotism and the affection for one's own people and traditions, conventional morality, traditional art and literature.

"Leo Strauss called it the *reductio ad Hitlerum*. If Hitler liked neoclassical art, that means that classicism in every form is Nazi; if Hitler wanted to strengthen the German family, that makes the traditional family (and its defenders) Nazi; if Hitler spoke of the "nation" or the "folk," then any invocation of nationality, ethnicity, or even folkishness is Nazi ..."

— Thomas Fleming, editor, *Chronicles* (Rockford, Illinois), May 2000, p. 11.

A Dark Secret of World War II Comes to Light

After more than half a century, facts about a grim chapter of World War II history are coming to light: the widespread rape by American military servicemen of local women on the Pacific island of Okinawa. The discovery in 1998 of the bones of three wartime US Marine Corps men, each one 19 years old and black, has — according to a *New York Times* report (June 1, 2000) — "refocused attention on what historians say is one of the most widely ignored crimes of the war, the widespread rape of Okinawan women by American servicemen."

More than 200,000 soldiers and civilians, including one-third of the population of Okinawa, were killed in the April-June 1945 battle for the Pacific island.

As many as 10,000 Okinawan women may have been raped, one scholar estimates. Rape was so prevalent in the months following US subjugation of the island that most Okinawans over age 65 either know or have heard of a woman who was raped in the aftermath of the war. Marine Corps officials say they have no records of such mass rapes, but books, diaries, newspaper articles and other documents refer to rapes by American soldiers of various races and backgrounds. Apparently few if any Okinawan women reported being attacked out of fear and embarrassment, and those who did were ignored by the US military police.

The three black Marines whose bones were found in 1998, and who were identified by dental records, were apparently killed by men of the remote Okinawan village of Katsuyama because the three had repeatedly come to their village to rape their women. Elderly Okinawans who grew up in village told a *New York Times* reporter that three armed Marines would come to Katsuyama every weekend and force the village men to take them to their women, who were then carried off to the hills and raped. One day, villagers, with the help of two armed Japanese soldiers who were hiding in the jungle, ambushed three marines in a mountain pass. They were shot and beaten to death with sticks and stones, and their bodies dumped in a hillside cave. Because the three were black, the cave where their bodies were dumped became known as "Cave of the Negroes."

"It would be unfair for the public to get the impression that we were all a bunch of rapists after we worked so hard to serve our country," says Samuel Saxton, a retired Marine Corps Captain who has an interest in the case. There are no plans to prosecute anyone for the crimes.

— *M.W.*

Visit www.ihr.org

IHR Internet Web Site Offers Worldwide Access to Revisionism

On its own Internet web site, **www.ihr.org**, the Institute for Historical Review makes available an impressive selection of IHR material, including dozens of IHR *Journal* articles and reviews. It also includes a listing of every item that has ever appeared in this Journal, as well as the complete texts of *The Zionist Terror Network*, "The Leuchter Report," and Kulaszka's encyclopedic work *Did Six Million Really Die?*. New material is added as time permits.

Specific information or items can easily be found by entering key words on the site's built-in search feature.

Through the IHR web site, revisionist scholarship is instantly available to millions of computer users worldwide, free of censorship by governments or powerful special interest groups. It can be reached 24 hours a day from around the globe through the World Wide Web (WWW), a multimedia Internet service.

Journal associate editor Greg Raven maintains and operates this site as its "webmaster." Because it is linked to several other revisionist (and anti-revisionist) web sites, visitors can easily access vast amounts of additional information.

The IHR web site address is
http://www.ihr.org
E-mail messages can be sent to
ihr@ihr.org

Foreign Eyes

"The world looks at Germany. Any form of historical revisionism would make us not credible in the eyes of Washington or Jerusalem."

— Volkhard Knigge, Director of the Buchenwald camp memorial center in Germany. Quoted in: *D. National-Zeitung* (Munich), May 31, 1996, p. 1.

Suppressing Debate about Auschwitz:

The Rudolf Case, Irving's Lost Libel Suit and the Future of Revisionism

COSTAS ZAVERDINOS

This essay illustrates how Germar Rudolf, a young German chemist who is passionate about objective truth, was condemned as the exact opposite, and even labeled a "neo-Nazi," by a prejudiced and ignorant society.[1] In the months since British historian David Irving (sometimes called a revisionist) lost his libel case against American Jewish activist Deborah Lipstadt — largely, I believe, because of his ignorance of Rudolf's work — the issues raised in his headline-making trial have become all the more urgent for the future of revisionism.

All too often history is written for propaganda purposes. This is especially common when a state strives to inculcate the youth with its political views, but it also occurs when zealous writers seek to defend the historical rights, as they see them, of their own people.

Can history be objective? The question seems to have been first asked two and a half thousand years ago by Thucydides, historian of the 30-year war between ancient Athens and Sparta. At the beginning of his *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Thucydides states that his aim is to preserve an accurate record of the war, not only for its intrinsic interest but in the hope this would be useful for "those who desire an exact knowledge of the past as a key to the future." He wished his *History* to be "a possession forever, not the rhetorical triumph of an hour."[2]

Thucydides writes that as other authors "take rumors for granted and copy uncritically from each other," his own work "because of its lack of fiction may be less pleasing than theirs."[3] This sentiment is the hallmark of a true historian: aiming to separate myth from reality and not to please any party.[4]

Costas Zaverdinos, in front of a projector screen, addressing the special IHR meeting, March 28, 1998, in southern California.

This goal can only be achieved by closely examining all the available evidence. As Italian scholar Carlo Mattogno has emphasized, there is really nothing new about Holocaust revisionism: it simply calls for the same evidential rigor that is normally demanded when historians examine events other than the "Nazi genocide of the Jews."[5]

History is important because the way we perceive the past fundamentally — and often unconsciously — affects our perception of the present. For example, Nicholas Ridley, a minister in the British government of Margaret Thatcher, cited Auschwitz and all it stands for as an argument to keep Britain out of the European Union, in which Germany plays a major role. Others see the Union as a means of "keeping Germany in check." On the eve of Germany's reunification, author Günther Grass

---

Costas Zaverdinos was born in Johannesburg, South Africa, in 1938. Since 1970 he has been with the University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg), which awarded him a Ph.D. in mathematics in 1984. He is currently an honorary senior lecturer with the University's School of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Technology of the Faculty of Science. He is the author of several papers in internationally recognized scholarly journals. Since 1997 he has been a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee. (For more about him, see the May-June 1997 *Journal*, p. 19) This essay is adapted from an address he gave at an IHR meeting in southern California on March 28, 1998.

remarked that "Auschwitz speaks against our right to self-determination," showing how in modern Germany patriotism has been completely turned on its head.[6]

Nearly all the evidence supporting allegations of mass homicidal gassings in wartime Germany is eyewitness testimony, given at postwar trials of alleged war criminals or written down after the war, often decades later. The critical historian wishes to distinguish carefully between what a witness claims to have seen personally and what he or she has heard from others.

Historians should have asked some basic questions before concluding that German authorities planned the physical destruction of all Jews, and used gas chambers to carry out mass killings. As pioneer revisionists such as Robert Faurisson have demanded: show us an order, not necessarily from Hitler, but from any of his subordinates, to exterminate the Jews just because they were Jews; and, "show me or draw me a Nazi gas chamber!"[7]

At the Nuremberg "International Military Tribunal" of 1945-1946, or at the great Frankfurt "Auschwitz Trial" of 1963-1965, where defendants were convicted of participating in so-called selections of victims for gas chambers, the defense did not demand that forensic scientists examine the alleged "weapon of the crime," that is the homicidal gas chamber. Why not? This is remarkable, considering that scholars of ancient history defer to the archaeologist, not only when in doubt, but as a matter of course?[8]

Although there may be more to this problem, there seems little doubt that the rot set in at the main Nuremberg trial, the International Military Tribunal (IMT), which set the precedent in not only requiring no scientific evidence for the worst allegations of mass murder, but actually forbidding any such evidence.[9] This meant that the Nuremberg court could accept allegations as "self-evident" facts and that it could (indeed, was bound to) take seriously any report made by Soviet and other "special commissions" expressly set up to "investigate" the alleged crimes.[10]

Today, hardly anyone claims that the Germans manufactured soap from murdered Jews. But why did it take many decades to admit this officially? Was it really so difficult to carry out a forensic test of any one of the notorious soap bars marked "RIF"? The irony is a sample of "human soap" was submitted evidence at Nuremberg by the Soviets with no effort by the defense to challenge its authenticity.[11]

Several other "facts" — also "proven" at Nuremberg — are no longer taken seriously by historians,

Germar Rudolf addressing the 13th IHR Conference, May 2000.

such as homicidal gas chambers in camps located in the German "*Altreich*" (Germany in its borders of 1937), and bizarre killing machines operated with electricity or steam.[12]

The Leuchter, Rudolf and Cracow Reports

Some readers will be familiar with the origin of the *Leuchter Report*. The German-Canadian publicist Ernst Zündel was twice put on trial for allegedly knowingly spreading "false news" because he republished *Did Six Million Really Die?*, an early revisionist booklet by Richard Harwood (Richard Verral) that was banned in numerous countries, including South Africa.[13]

For the second trial in 1988,[14] Zündel engaged Fred Leuchter, widely acknowledged as the foremost US authority on execution gas chambers, as an expert witness. He sent Leuchter to Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek to determine, based on an evaluation of samples taken there, and other factors, whether the alleged extermination facilities there could have performed their grisly task as claimed.

It is generally agreed that hydrocyanic acid (HCN), a poisonous gas, was widely used at Auschwitz-Birkenau, and that it was extensively

used to kill lice and other disease-carrying vermin. The gas was contained in a commercially-produced pesticide, Zyklon B.[15] For nearly 30 years a small group of historians has questioned the widely held view that this gas was used to kill hundreds of thousands of prisoners there. If the allegations are true, shouldn't traces of this gas be detectable today? Fred Leuchter took brick and mortar samples from an acknowledged disinfestation chamber, as well as from the ruins of crematory buildings (*Kremas*) where, it is widely alleged, mass killings with poison gas were carried out. These samples were later independently analyzed for cyanide residues by Alpha Analytical Laboratories in Ashland, Massachusetts. The results appeared astonishing: 1050 mg/kg of cyanide was found in the sample taken from the delousing chamber, but less than 10 mg/kg in the alleged homicidal chambers. This fact was cited in supporting Leuchter's conclusion that "none of the facilities examined were ever utilized for the execution of human beings."[16]

After issuing his report and testifying in April 1988 in the second Zündel trial in Toronto, Fred Leuchter came under vicious attack, above all from Jewish organizations. His health, marriage and livelihood were ruined, and he literally went into hiding in an effort to quietly rebuild his life.[17] But film maker Errol Morris persuaded him to cooperate in making "Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.", a film in which Ernst Zündel, David Irving and others also make appearances.[18] Having seen "Mr. Death," my overall impression is that Leuchter comes across as rather naive — even a bit of a "weirdo" — but not evil. On the other hand, those who brought him down appear as fanatics bent on destroying him at all costs. As with the Irving-Lipstadt trial, even bad publicity may be better than none. From a technical point of view, possibly the worst failing of "Mr. Death" is that it avoids any mention of the relatively huge concentration of cyanide found in Leuchter's sample taken from a non-homicidal delousing chamber.

Apart from attacks aimed at ruining his reputation and livelihood, there have been some reasoned criticisms of Leuchter, if not all of the same standard. One who thought he had decisively discredited the *Leuchter Report* (and the revisionists) was French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac.[19]

Aside from some uncalled for *ad hominem* attacks against Leuchter, Pressac raised pertinent issues that called for reasoned response. For example, he made the important point that much smaller amounts of hydrocyanic acid are needed to kill humans than lice, and that the delousing chambers were exposed to warm gas (to increase its effect) and for much longer periods than those (allegedly) used to kill human beings.[20] Regarding the matter of remnants of cyanide in the "homicidal gas chambers," Pressac claimed that after nearly half a century of exposure to the elements "it is practically a miracle that any measurable traces of hydrocyanic compounds still remain."[21] The inside walls of some of the delousing chambers are quite blue with ferric ferrocyanide (commonly known as Prussian Blue) as a result of their exposure to HCN, but Pressac goes so far as to claim that "the 'blue wall phenomenon' ... permits the immediate distinction ... with absolute certainty between delousing gas chambers, where the phenomenon is present, and the homicidal gas chambers, where it is not."[22] He further writes: "... In a homicidal gas chamber, the action of highly concentrated HCN was rapid and intense (never more than 15 to 20 minutes), then the room was aired ... as quickly as possible ... The acid ... did not have enough time to impregnate and stain the brick."[23]

It took a man of letters to first propose that the chemistry of the gas chambers be investigated by competent scientists: Robert Faurisson suggested the idea of taking brick and mortar samples to be later analyzed. Others, notably William Brian Lindsey, have considered chemical aspects of the problem.[24] Germar Rudolf, a graduate doctoral student employed by the prestigious Max Planck Institute for Solid State Physics in Stuttgart, began his own investigations in the early 1990s. He set himself the task of thoroughly investigating problems such as those posed by Pressac, who had written that the formation of Prussian Blue "occurs under the influence of various physico-chemical factors which have not yet been studied."[25]

At about the same time, Paul Grubach in an article titled "The Leuchter Report Vindicated," dismissed some of Pressac's claims by pointing out that damp and cool environments favor the formation of stable iron compounds; heating *prevented* condensation of the gas. Like Leuchter, he concluded that "if the alleged extermination gas chambers had actually been used to kill people..., ferric ferrocyanide [Prussian Blue] would have been found in them in amounts comparable to those found in the delousing facility."[26]

In 1989, the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute in Cracow, Poland, commissioned by the Auschwitz State Museum, took samples from the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz and Birkenau, and conducted its own chemical tests, the results of which, in the eyes of many revisionists, appeared to confirm

Leuchter's findings, even though the Cracow Institute itself came to the opposite conclusion. (More will be said on this below).[27]

Germar Rudolf praised the *Leuchter Report* for its "ice-breaking function" which, he said was of "inestimable value." But he also had some criticisms:

> First of all, as a scientist one checks carefully if the work is solidly backed up by references to competent authorities. Unfortunately, Leuchter's report hardly has such a foundation. For one thing, none of the chemical conclusions is properly referenced. On their own, a few chemical results say nothing; they must be correctly interpreted. One cannot simply claim: there are no cyanides, therefore nobody was gassed. In the end, there could be other explanations for the lack of cyanide compounds. Leuchter ought to have scientifically eliminated these beforehand.

According to Rudolf, other shortcomings were that only one sample was taken from a delousing chamber and that there was no control analysis. Leuchter, a non-chemist, should have consulted specialists in this field. He had no original plans, which led him to make the incorrect claim that the *Leichenkeller* (underground morgues) in *Kremas* (crematory buildings) II and III had no ventilation. "Leuchter regards an approximately 1% by volume mixture of HCN with air as explosive while a table in his report clearly shows that only concentrations of more than 5% are explosive."[28]

Austrian engineer Walter Lüftl shared Rudolf's view that "Leuchter is correct, even though he provided no detailed scientific proof in his report," adding that the final word has not been said on this subject.[29]

At the Ninth IHR Conference in 1989 Leuchter himself called for the formation of an "international commission of scientists, historians and scholars to investigate the facilities in Poland and make an impartial report of their findings to the world at large."[30]

When Rudolf first came across Leuchter's report, he told *Journal* contributor Fritz Berg: "I felt as though I had been hit on the head. I knew it straight away, either this American was a charlatan or my entire world-picture was completely false." To Berg's question, whether Leuchter had persuaded him, Rudolf replied "No, not at all," explaining that more questions were left open than had been answered, but he was keen to apply his scientific knowledge to test independently the validity of revisionist arguments.[31]

David Irving addresses the 13th IHR Conference, May 28, 2000.

Writing that Leuchter's study "should not be regarded as the end but rather as the beginning of more comprehensive investigations of the subject,"[32] Rudolf recalled that he had expressed some of these reservations in a 1990 letter to the German periodical *Junge Freiheit*, noting that "Leuchter's report does not tell us in exactly what condition the supposed gas chambers are, how stable these residues (more precisely, cyanide compounds) are, and moreover whether they would even have formed in the first place ..."[33]

Otto Ernst Remer, who as a German army officer played a major role in putting down the ill-fated anti-Hitler *Putsch* of July 20, 1944, had for years disputed the "gas chamber" claims, and was consequently indicted for "incitement of the people," "disparaging the memory of the dead" and "inciting racial hatred," and sentenced to 22 months imprisonment.[34]

As a result of Rudolf's letter to *Junge Freiheit*, Hajo Hermann, attorney for Remer, came into con-

tact with the young scientist and commissioned him to compile a Leuchter-like forensic report on the alleged "gas chambers" of Auschwitz.[35]

This was a unique opportunity for Rudolf to further explore the issue. Having made a thorough study of the extant literature, he traveled to Auschwitz (including Birkenau) where he took brick, concrete and mortar samples from various facilities. Rudolf's 119-page report, *Das Rudolf Gutachten* (the *Rudolf Report*), is a thorough technical investigation of the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz-Birkenau, which seems to confirm and complement the *Leuchter Report* in a spectacular way.[36]

In the first chapter of his *Report*, "Construction Methods used for the Gassing Facilities at Auschwitz," Rudolf points out that a study of such methods is important because the type of building material and the way it was used, as well as how the various facilities were outfitted, could have significantly affected the formation of cyanide compounds.

In Chapter 2, "Formation and Stability of Prussian Blue," Rudolf discusses in detail the composition and properties of cyanide compounds, in particular those of the extremely stable and insoluble iron compound ferric ferrocyanide (Prussian Blue), as well as the conditions under which such compounds may form. The author considers the influence of moisture, reactivity of iron, temperature (which affects the adsorption, or sticking-effect, of hydrogen cyanide gas on walls) and the effects of acidity levels. Rudolf goes deeply into the question of the long-term stability of Prussian Blue,[13] thoroughly surveying a number of related questions.

In chapter 3, "Procedures for Gassing with Hydrocyanic Acid (HCN)," Rudolf presents an overview of the toxicology of HCN, and he compares the gassing procedures for delousing chambers and what they theoretically should have been for the alleged homicidal chambers. He argues that eyewitness accounts, in particular the commonly made claim that death followed quickly (3-10 minutes) implies that large amounts of Zyklon B would have been needed to carry out the killing process. This affects the detectability of cyanide compounds today, as do other factors, such as the rate of evaporation of HCN gas from its holding material,[14] the distribution of Zyklon B in the underground *Leichenkeller* (morgue cellar) No.1 of Birkenau *Kremas* II and III[39] (the 'homicidal gas chambers'), and the rate at which the morgues were ventilated, as well as their dampness.

In chapter 4, "Evaluation of the Chemical Analyses," Rudolf relates how the samples he collected were analyzed by the prestigious Institut Fresenius in Taunusstein, Hessen, Germany, without the institute being informed of the origin of the samples.[40]

This chapter includes a comparison of the methods and results of the Institut Fresenius, Alpha Analytical Laboratories and the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute. Rudolf regards the analytical method of the Cracow institute as altogether unreliable, mainly because it excludes the possibility of detecting stable compounds of cyanide like Prussian Blue, which should account for the vast majority of compounds detectable today.[41] Table 15 in Rudolf's *Report* gives the precise place from where each sample was taken, the type of material it contains, the depth in the wall from which it originated, the iron concentration and, finally, the cyanide (CN-) content, measured in the standard ratio of milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). Results from morgue No. 1 in *Krema* II, allegedly the chief killing location, show concentrations of 7.2 mg/kg or less, while the samples from the inner and outer walls of the delousing chambers show up to 13,500 mg/kg, quantities which are not merely larger but of different order. Rudolf also discusses the results of experiments in which he exposed building material to HCN under various laboratory conditions.

The fifth chapter contains Rudolf's conclusions (cited below). In chapter six, "Critique of Counter Reports," he responds to the 1945 and 1990 expert reports by the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute (Cracow),[42] and also to the "anti-Leuchter" findings of French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac, German writer Werner Wegner,[43] G. Wellers, Austrian chemist J. Bailer,[44] Prof. G. Jagschitz,[45] and historian Gerald Fleming.

Prussian Blue stains are formed on walls as follows: First the hydrocyanic acid (HCN) gas sticks to the walls, where it is adsorbed on the surface in a purely physical process. Later HCN combines with ferrous iron and, eventually, ferric iron in the building materials to form the permanent blue compound.[46] Finally, the compound begins to "migrate" into and through the wall.[47] The presence of moisture, as in the damp morgue-cellars of Birkenau *Kremas* II and III, hastens this chemical process, which may take a long time to complete.

This can be observed in Auschwitz-Birkenau buildings BW (*Bauwerk*) 5a and 5b, which had delousing or disinfestation chambers that used Zyklon B. The north-west interior wall of the delousing tract in building BW 5a shows intense blue coloring, and there are dark blue patches on the exterior walls of both these buildings, especially the wall of

BW 5b which was exposed to wet westerly winds. This shows that Prussian Blue has "migrated" right through the brick. The claim that exposure to the elements would have "washed away" any cyanide compounds is thus shown to be false.[48] On the contrary, as Rudolf explains, the wet Polish winds have encouraged the process of Prussian Blue formation in the walls of the disinfestation chambers (especially the west-facing outer-wall of the gas chamber in building BW 5b). If Birkenau's alleged homicidal "gas chambers" — the damp morgue rooms in *Kremas* II and III — had been exposed to Zyklon/HCN as claimed, Prussian Blue staining should have been similarly visible.

Rudolf cites the interesting case of a sample of building material taken from a farmhouse in the Bavarian countryside that showed a cyanide concentration of 9.6 mg/kg, which is of the same order as the 7.2 mg/kg found in the "gas chamber" of *Krema* II. This suggests that such low concentrations may well be a phenomenon of nature, or be below the practical detection level.[49]

Some revisionists have suggested that the morgue cellars (where homicidal gassings were allegedly carried out) may have been disinfected from time to time with HCN, thus accounting for these low levels of cyanide. This is possible,[50] but pharmacist Pressac has plausibly pointed out that HCN would not normally be used as a disinfectant.[51] As already noted, however, it appears that such low concentrations may have nothing to do with occasional exposure to Zyklon (HCN). In fact, though, we simply do not know if the morgues were disinfected with Zyklon B or not. If the figures for cyanide found in the *Leichenkeller* indeed have nothing to do with applications of Zyklon B, that would surely be more satisfactory than having to account for partial gassings there.

Rudolf's Concluding Remarks

(A) The investigation concerning the formation and long-term stability of cyanide remnants in the witnessed facilities and the analysis of the brick and mortar samples resulted in the following conclusions:[52]

1. The cyanide in the walls, which has been activated into Prussian Blue possesses a long-term stability of centuries ... Cyanide remnants should therefore be detectable in almost undiminished quantities, irrespective of the influence of the weather. This is proved by the intense blue in the outer walls of the delousing chambers of the buildings BW 5a and 5b which contain large amounts of cyanide.

"One Louse, Your Death!" This bilingual poster (German and Polish) warned prisoners at Auschwitz-Birkenau of the ever-present danger of typhus-bearing lice. This same emphatic warning appeared in large letters on the wall of Birkenau's main sauna (disinfestation center). Amazingly, a German court found that, in citing this in his forensic report, Germar Rudolf "cynically ... identifies with National Socialist terminology."

2. Under the actual conditions, as testified to by eyewitnesses of massive homicidal gassing in the disputed chambers, traces of cyanide residues would have formed of the same order of magnitude as those found in the delousing chambers, including the blue coloration of the walls.

3. The traces found in the alleged gas chambers are just as insignificant as those to be found in any building chosen at random.

Conclusion: On chemical and physical grounds, the mass gassing with hydrocyanic acid in the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz, as described by witnesses, could not have taken place.

(B) The investigation of the practical and technical data regarding the witnessed mass gassing in the indicated facilities and their physical and chemical analyses resulted in the following conclusions:

1. The alleged main gas chambers of Auschwitz,

that is the morgue in the main camp, and the morgue number 1 of *Kremas* II and III in Birkenau, had no means to introduce the poison. Holes visible today in the roofs were made after the war.

2. The release of the lethal hydrogen cyanide gas from its carrier material could not have taken place in the short time span indicated by eyewitnesses. In fact, it would have taken hours before the gas was completely released.

3. The necessary ventilation of the alleged gas chambers of *Kremas* II and III, at the rate of one air exchange every 15 minutes would have taken at least two hours, contradicting all eyewitness accounts.

4. An effective ventilation of the alleged gas chambers of *Kremas* IV and V and Bunkers I and II[53] was not possible. The *Sonderkommandos* could not have removed the corpses from the chambers without wearing protective clothing and gas masks fitted with a special filter.

Conclusion: The mass gassing as described by witnesses cross-examined before courts, as stated in verdicts and published in literary and scientific writings could not, for chemical and physical reasons, have taken place.[54]

Rudolf concludes with the declaration: "The author of this report can only refer to *existing* eyewitness accounts and documents, which can be the *only* basis for any historical consideration of the matters under discussion. Should the belief nevertheless arise that the eyewitnesses erred in their statements, then the author of the present report can only assert that there is *no* other basis for putting together a specialist report, and therefore ... there is no longer any legal basis for courts to prosecute certain opinions. The invention of new mass-murder techniques and scenarios which contradict all eyewitness testimony may be fine for the Hollywood horror industry but is unsuited for writing history."

Not all these conclusions are new, but as a scientist Rudolf rightly emphasizes that he can only go by *existing* evidence, either based on eyewitnesses testimony or on accepted scientific principles.

The 1994 Cracow Institute Report

In 1994 the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute published a second, lengthier technical report on the Auschwitz gas chambers, basing its conclusions on chemical analyses of numerous brick and mortar samples taken from various buildings.[55] If one accepts the methods used by the authors of this report, the results would appear to prove that there *were* homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz, as they found cyanide residues in the (non-homicidal) delousing chambers in amounts comparable to those found in morgue No. 1 of *Krema* II (an alleged homicidal gas chamber).

What, if anything, is wrong here? The Polish investigators called the blue wall phenomenon "controversial," and possibly due to paint! In a fax exchange with the Cracow Institute and the authors of this report, Germar Rudolf reminded them that, by their own admission, they had deliberately chosen an analytic method that would not detect Prussian Blue,[56] that is, the vast majority of stable cyanide compounds present in the walls.[57] This fact is crucial to their results and cannot be overemphasized, especially given that the Polish researchers offer no satisfactory explanation for their assertion that the Prussian Blue stains are "controversial," apart from the arbitrary conjecture that "this dye" (as they call it) may have resulted from "paint." They were not even sure if the "blue" was due to cyanide, something they could easily have ascertained.[58]

If the standard DIN method used by Rudolf is the proper or correct one, then, we can conclude, with Rudolf, that the chemical results of the Jan Sehn Institute are completely meaningless.

Even a single gassing with hydrocyanic acid can be instructive. A fascinating instance of a one-time gassing is that of a church which was treated with HCN to rid the woodwork of bore beetles. A few months later intense blue patches began to show on the walls, and eventually all the plaster had to be removed to get rid of the Prussian Blue. The significance of this is clear: even a single gassing can result in the formation of large remnants of cyanide. It should be noted that the interior church walls had been freshly plastered some weeks before they were exposed to HCN, and that the chemical reaction producing Prussian Blue stopped only a year later, confirming the long-term action of the process.[59]

Professor Richard Green, a chemist, joined the discussion — against the "deniers," as he calls them — about the conditions under which Prussian Blue is formed. While accepting that cyanide compounds of iron are present in the delousing chambers, he disputes whether they would have formed in the "homicidal gas chambers." Green regards Rudolf's "church" example as an exception rather than the rule, and believes that the Jan Sehn Institute's 1994 report "provided real information."[60]

John C. Zimmerman, an Asssociate Professor at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, responded critically to a *Los Angeles Times* article[61] that had given a fair description of Rudolf's forensic results.

In a letter published in the paper,[62] Zimmerman wrote: "The problem for deniers like Rudolf is to explain why any traces of poison gas turned up in structures identified by numerous eyewitnesses as homicidal gas chambers."

In a reply to Zimmerman, Rudolf wrote: "Contrary to your false claim, I have no problems to explain the minimal cyanide residues in the walls of those morgues: They are not reproducible and in the same order of magnitude as in samples taken from all sorts of locations. In other words: These values close to the detection level cannot be interpreted at all." Rudolf also reminded Zimmerman of the faults of the second Cracow report.[63]

Because the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute used much the same methods for both its reports, revisionists should not cite the earlier report as somehow confirming Leuchter's findings.[64]

(One of the charges brought against Rudolf in 1993 was, remarkably, the publication of his correspondence with the Jan Sehn Institute in the Berlin periodical *Sleipnir*.)[65]



Costas Zaverdinos and Mark Weber

The Trial of Germar Rudolf

The court in Schweinfurt, Germany, that tried Otto Ernst Remer refused to accept Rudolf's *Report* in evidence. It found the former Major General guilty of the charges brought against him, and, in October 1992, sentenced him to 22 months imprisonment. Before fleeing to Spain in February 1994 he once again showed his defiance by adding his own polemical comments to a new edition of Rudolf's *Report*, publishing it, and then distributing it to leading German personalities, including many accomplished professors of inorganic chemistry. Remer's foreword or preface, as well as the epilogue (afterword) were added without Germar Rudolf's permission. When copies of the new edition began arriving at the Max Planck Institute in the middle of April 1993, heated discussions took place between Rudolf and his doctoral supervisor, Professor H. G. von Schnering. A letter of complaint by the Central Council of German Jews expressed anxiety that the Report "might all too easily be used as pseudo-scientific support for denial of the mass murder of the Jews."[66]

The uproar led not only to Rudolf's dismissal from the Max Planck Institute,[67] but also to his indictment for collaboration with Remer. Formal charges were brought against him on April 19, 1994, [68] with the indictment accusing him of having "concomitantly (1) attacked the dignity of others in a way suited to disturbing public order by (a) inciting hatred against sections of the population (b) abusing these people, maliciously making them appear despicable and calumniating them; (2) defamed the memory of the dead, and (3) defamed others."[69]

In the indictment as well as the judgment (*Urteil*), the term *Gutachten* (expert report) is consistently given in quotation marks, apparently to denigrate the value of Rudolf's forensic investigation. We read in the indictment, for example: "In this '*Gutachten*', the notorious systematic mass murder of the Jews, which was committed by means of gas chambers in concentration camps of the Third Reich, in particular at Auschwitz-Birkenau, is denied in a degrading way and, in at least a partial identification with Nazi persecution and motivated by a tendency to exonerate National Socialism from the stain of having murdered the Jews, it is claimed that as a result of allegedly scientific research [*angeblich wissenschaftlich fundierter Untersuchungen*], neither at Auschwitz nor at Birkenau were there gas chambers for the destruction of human beings nor were they suitable for such a purpose."[70]

The indictment then quotes Rudolf's "Concluding Assessments" (A) and (B) as given above, and goes on to state that the accompanying text of the 'Gutachten' "blames the Jews for the 'gassing lie'." The indictment supports the charges against Rudolf by accusing him of sanctioning these additions as well as their distribution — although it accepts that he did not write them. The charges are further justified with the claim that the "degrading denial" of the "historically documented murder of Jews in gas chambers... represents a particularly serious slur on their memory," and the allegation that the

"actual [factual?] determinations [*tatsächlichen Feststellungen]* of the 'Gutachten' are completely unsuited for proving the conclusions (A) and (B)." It is further alleged that "considering the content of the 'Gutachten' and the accompanying text, it follows that the accused identifies with National Socialist racist ideology, and is thus determined to arouse feelings of hatred toward the Jews ..."

Remer's foreword holds German politicians and the media responsible for what is called an "unbelievably satanical distortion of history," and Jews are not even mentioned. The added epilogue — which covers Remer's trial and some revisionist material — consists only of brief quotes from a few Jewish personalities.[71]

Thus the charge that Rudolf "blames the Jews for the 'gassing lie'" was paper-thin to begin with. My understanding is that the "aggavating circumstances" — his revisionist work — was the real object of the trial, as I will try to show.

Although during the trial he categorically denied having collaborated with Remer, Rudolf has subsequently acknowledged that, through a third person he, in fact, gave Remer permission to distribute what he thought would be the *unpoliticized* version of his Report.[72] In a deposition he explained that publication of the politicized version of his *Report* could only have detracted from its value. For one thing, it had already appeared in all its essentials under the pen-name of Ernst Gauss in the book *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* before Remer's action had begun.

Rudolf has repeatedly stressed, both before and during the trial, that only dry, material arguments have a chance to be being taken seriously. It is difficult to see how the court could regard such an attitude, which he repeatedly emphasized in writings and dealings with others, as "particularly refined deception." In his deposition he explained that the pen name "Ernst Gauss" had gained prestige, while the name of Otto Ernst Remer "is not an advertisement, as the public prosecutor alleges, rather it frightens people off [from reading revisionist literature]."[73]

Without justification the court regarded as insincere even statements made by Rudolf in private letters. In a personal letter to his godmother, for example, he rejected David Irving's "propaganda methods," and wrote of Remer, "I do not wish to be associated with his totally obnoxious views."[74] The judges cited this as an "index" of how Rudolf played down his connections with the extreme right! In the court's opinion the publication of Remer's edition of the *Rudolf Report* was a "publicity trick" which served as an advertisement for the later authorized version. Allegedly, another purpose of Remer's publication was to enable Rudolf to avoid the penal consequences of publishing the official version! The court declared: "The *'Gutachten'* was ... the basis of a 'revisionist' publication campaign in which the theme of Auschwitz was discussed at various levels in order to force a public debate on the issue."[75]

Imagine! A public debate! How dare Rudolf! In its judgment the court claimed that because Rudolf could not find a publisher for his report outside the "national camp," and in order "to avoid possible negative repercussions for his career..., he, together with his co-workers feigned the self-defense action[76] of a third person," namely Remer, whereby the accused would "create the impression that he would be under pressure to prove his supposedly pure scientific aims by opposing the out-of-date Remer-version of the *'Gutachten'* with that of a more current and purified version."[77] This nonsense continues with the claim that "finally, by sending it to all professors of inorganic chemistry, from whom he expected no reaction,[78] the foundation would be laid for the later pseudo-argument that allegedly no technical errors had been found in the *'Gutachten'*."[79]

Not once did the court address any of Rudolf's technical arguments, while it regarded his conclusions — (A) and (B), above — as constituting aggravating circumstances. Further aggravating circumstances were that Rudolf continued his revisionist work during the trial. The court cynically pronounced that "freedom of the sciences remains unrestricted, and is unaffected by the verdict ... In its totality, the Remer version of the *'Gutachten'* ... is not scholarly. This follows already from the polemical character of the comments ... the court does not need to test whether parts are of a scientific nature or not — which, considering the political objectives of the accused and the way he treats facts..., seems improbable. The accused and his accomplices made use of the scientific-looking major section of the work with the express aim of committing the stated offence by means of the foreword and accompanying text."[80]

The court ordered a "self-reading procedure" for the *Report* itself, so that it was not be read in open court. The court justified this order by explaining that "in spite of damage done to transparency," "the work is extremely extensive and difficult to read and understand," thus implicitly admitting it was not qualified to form an opinion on the technical issues discussed by Rudolf.[81] While seemingly conceding that the *Report* is written in an "essentially

scientific style" (*im wesentlichen wissenschaftlichen Stil gehalten*), the court withdrew its "recognition" by tying a "strategy" to the *Stil*. The "*Report*," it patronizingly stated, "is concerned with a "difficult to explain ... chemical detail,"[82] "whose real purpose is, following a common 'revisionist' strategy, to fix on a central point and then draw general conclusions."[83] Throughout the trial the court maintained that Rudolf's methodology has only the appearance of objectivity, his arguments are "pseudo-arguments," there is merely a "claim to scholarship," and that he merely gave the "impression" of being an unprejudiced researcher.[84] In his submission for a review, attorney Ludwig Bock emphasized the court's negligence in testing any of the *Report's* theses, let alone whether Rudolf's arguments had any substance to them.

On a wall of the main Sauna at Auschwitz, one can still see the slogan *Eine Laus Dein Tod* ("One Louse Your Death"), warning prisoners of the ever-present danger of typhus. Because this is quoted in Rudolf's *Report*, the court found that the accused "cynically ... identifies with National Socialist terminology." As Rudolf comments in a note, "the truth is not cynical; cynical are judges who punish the proclamation of truth under the pretext of protecting the law."[85]

The court refused to admit extensive testimony that would have favored the defendant. For example, it dismissed as of no importance the avowal by a Jewish friend that Rudolf was no anti-Semite.[86]

Likewise, the court regarded as insignificant the fact that Rudolf had given a public lecture praising the German-Jewish patriot Eduard von Simson, the first president of the Reichstag. Similarly, in an introductory chapter of the anthology *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte,* Rudolf expressed the hope that a resolution of the Holocaust issue might lead to a re-establishment of the fruitful German-Jewish "symbiosis." "In any case it is my wish, that both peoples may again find each other in a partnership of mutual respect and resume an epoch which brought so many benefits to the world, to Jewry and to the German people. It is also my wish that a chapter of history which has been full of mutual contempt, mistrust and fear can be finally closed. I long for the end of a period which, like none other before it, has brought so much unhappiness to the world, to Jews and Germans."[87] The court arbitrarily dismissed this sincere appeal for reconciliation as merely an "attempt to make an impression."[88]

That the court saw Rudolf's "crimes" as more than his alleged approval of Remer's additions to his *Report* is already clear from the court's repeated citing of Rudolf's revisionist work, including *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* and *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, both of which had nothing at all to do with the main charge. In support of its award of punishment, the court asserted that by means of his "specially refined and concealed strategy ... the accused made it as difficult as possible for the victims [survivors] to defend themselves."[89] I interpret this as saying (among possibly other things) that the arguments in Rudolf's *Report* leading up to his conclusions appeared extremely difficult to see through.

On June 23, 1995, Germar Rudolf was sentenced to 14 months imprisonment. According to Judge Dietmar Mayer, Rudolf, who continued his revisionist work (for example on *Grundlagen*) "in spite of and while the trial was proceeding" was "an anti-Semite fanatically committed to the cause of Holocaust denial [*fanatischer Überzeugungstäter*]," with the result that no part of the sentence could be suspended. Thus there were "no mitigating circumstances which would make his offence 'more understandable.' On the contrary, the calculating and refined way in which he camouflaged his crime is to be seen as particularly aggravating."[90]

One of the major flaws in the German judicial system is the lack of any records of statements made by witnesses. Since 1979 even summaries of such statements were dispensed with, thus allowing for later distortions and even contradictions during judgment.[91]

Significantly, during the post-war trials of "war criminals" this same system was in operation.[92]

Because he had been convicted of a "thought crime," the University of Stuttgart refused to accept Rudolf's doctoral thesis — ironically on the basis of a 1939 law signed by Hitler that permits German universities to withdraw or withhold academic titles in cases of "lack of academic dignity."[93]

At the time of his flight from Germany there were other cases pending against Rudolf. Rather than serve his 14-month sentence, he fled the country, first going to Spain and then settling in England. Since its founding in 1997, Rudolf has been editor of the quarterly *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (*VffG*),[94] a scholarly, intellectually ambitious revisionist quarterly journal. Rudolf also runs Castle Hill Publishers, which has brought out new and important revisionist works.[95]

"German neo-Nazi fugitive is found hiding in Britain" headlined a report in the British *Sunday Telegraph* of October 17, 1999. The writers, Jessica Berry and Chris Hastings, claimed that they had "tracked down" a "neo-Nazi who fled Germany after being convicted of inciting racial hatred." Rudolf

was quoted as saying "In Britain I work as an Holocaust revisionist 24 hours a day. My work has brought me into contact with people on the far Right. I have met leading members of the National Front and the British National Party while I have been in England. I have also made contact with David Irving. But I want to make clear that I am not a member of any far-Right organisations. I am not a total apologist for the Nazis like a lot of people who support my work. I miss Germany but I am a political prisoner who came here because I wanted to be free."

Based on the *Sunday Telegraph* article, the German news agency dpa issued a report about the "wanted German neo-Nazi" that appeared in several German newspapers, and a German radio station told listeners that Germany's Jewish Community demanded that the German government ask Britain to extradite Rudolf to Germany.[96]

Rudolf immediately issued a response to the *Sunday Telegraph*, which the paper did not publish. In this letter of response,[97] Rudolf categorically denied that he ever was "involved in a neo-Nazi organisation," or held "political views which are even close to National Socialism." He was, in fact, "a patriotic conservative with strong libertarian convictions," adding that he had been living quite openly in England since he arrived there in the Spring of 1997, that the German police knew this and had not been "looking" for him. Furthermore, Rudolf continued, his only reason for contacting the head of the British National Party was because he "wanted to report [in *VffG*] about him [the BNP leader] being prosecuted for 'Holocaust denial'." Dismissing the imputation that he might be a partial "apologist for the Nazis," Rudolf wrote that his "business is not to apologize for what happened or did not happen in Germany 60 years ago, but to try to bring historiography into accord with the facts." Finally, he reminded the *Sunday Telegraph* of the circumstances under which he was unable to complete his doctorate, and that he had not been "expelled from [his] university course."

Rudolf also recalled that reporter Chris Hastings "was very curious about the situation in Germany regarding freedom of speech." Rudolf had told him of the thousands of prosecutions each year for "thought crimes," "as published by the German authorities," and that these authorities "burned many thousands of books" in recent years "even if German professors testified ... that some of these books are scientific and should be protected by ... internationally guaranteed human rights." Rudolf had "offered Hastings hard evidence for these things" but to no avail.[98] Instead, the *Sunday Telegraph* article reported that "the ease with which Rudolf has been able to continue his revisionist work ... has intensified calls for the introduction of Holocaust denial and race hate legislation in Britain. Andrew Dismore, the Labour MP for Hendon and a member of the Council Against Anti-Semitism, said: 'I think a cause like this can only strengthen the case for Holocaust denial legislation to be introduced in Britain. I hope the German authorities will take immediate action to deal with this man. I intend to refer the case to the Director of Public Prosecutions.' Lord Janner, the chairman of the Holocaust Education Trust, said: 'Holocaust denial legislation is long overdue in Britain. I intend to refer this particular case to the Home Secretary'."[99]

It is encouraging to note that former Conservative MPs Michael Howard and Sir Leon Brittan, to mention only two of Jewish origin, have vigorously opposed such legislation. The article confirmed that "there is a warrant out for [Rudolf's] arrest," and Rudolf told his supporters "They won't get me, I promise you all." "Did Britain fight two World Wars and sacrifice its empire in order to end up in a unified Europe that is being ruled by German political paranoia?," he asked in his letter to the *Sunday Telegraph*.

Two weeks later the *Sunday Telegraph* again reported on the Rudolf case. "The disclosure that Rudolf is likely to be extradited has been welcomed by MPs and Jewish groups. Stephen Twigg, the chairman of the lobby group Labour Friends of Israel, said: 'I welcome any action that would bring this man to justice.' Mike Gates MP, the vice-chairman of The Council Against Anti-Semitism said: 'This is excellent news. This country should not be used as a haven for people who have committed crimes abroad'."[100] In January 2000 this same paper assured its readers that "police here have joined the hunt for Germar Rudolf ... If he is arrested on British soil, he faces extradition or deportation. One source close to the case said: 'Concern about this man's presence in Britain has been raised at the very highest level. The Home Secretary is likely to want to do all he can to help the Germans bring this man to justice'."[101]

The manhunt turned into hysteria with a BBC report about Rudolf on March 28, 2000, which was repeated the next day by the south English regional TV station ITV. This television report included six or seven photographs of Rudolf, which had been taken from Rudolf's website. The public was warned to be aware of this "nazi sympathizer", as though

Rudolf was some dangerous skinhead. Michael Whine of the British Jewish Board of Deputies appeared on screen to announce that Britain was dealing with a "new breed of dangerous Nazis." The local press chimed in once again with a report on "Escaped Neo-nazi still hiding in Hastings ..."[102]

In May 2000, the British Home Secretary — responding to an inquiry by a Member of Parliament — stated: "The Government are aware of the reports in some quarters that Mr. Rudolf may be in the United Kingdom. The police have also been informed of the allegations against Mr. Rudolf."[103]

Thus Rudolf is treated as a common criminal. No one bothers to read a single word of his writings, let alone take any of it seriously. Or is his writing taken so seriously as to be regarded as a threat?[104]

The Irving-Lipstadt Libel Trial

In his well-publicized libel action against Deborah Lipstadt and Penguin Books for what Lipstadt had written about him in her book *Denying the Holocaust*,[105] British historian David Irving made almost no use of the *Rudolf Report*. Had he made good use of it he would possibly have stood a better chance in the London Royal Courts of Justice.[106] At least the airing of some of Rudolf's scientific research might have aroused wider public interest in revisionism. As it was, Irving had no legal representation, while the defendants' case was ably argued by Richard Rampton, Queen's Counsel.[107]

Deborah Lipstadt, professor of Jewish Studies at Emory University claimed in her book that "Irving is one of the most dangerous spokespersons for Holocaust denial. Familiar with historical evidence, he bends it until it conforms with his ideological leanings and political agenda."[108] Irving, she further stated, "is best known for his thesis that Hitler did not know about the Final Solution, an idea that scholars have dismissed ... he has been accused of skewing documents and misrepresenting data in order to reach historically untenable conclusions, particularly those that exonerate Hitler."[109] Most of Lipstadt's statements merely echo the opinions of others, and are properly referenced.[110]

The three-month trial began on January 11, 2000, and ended April 11, 2000, with Justice Gray's finding in favor of Lipstadt and Penguin Books.[111] Under English law a libel case favors the plaintiff because the defendants are obliged to prove the "substantial truth of the defamatory imputations."[112] It is fair to say that, had Irving brought this action in the United States, he would have stood just about zero chance of winning his case. The defendants called numerous "expert witnesses," who submitted lengthy "expert reports," for which they were handsomely paid.[113] They included Professor Richard Evans of Cambridge University (England), Robert Jan van Pelt, author (with Debórah Dwork) of a detailed book about Auschwitz,[114] as well as the American historian Christopher Browning,[115] and the German historian Dr. Heinz Peter Longerich.

Irving claimed that the defendants conspired with what he calls "the traditional enemies of truth" to ruin his reputation and income. They influenced publishers not to publish his books and even to break existing contracts.[116] Justice Gray correctly identified these "traditional enemies" as Jewish[117] and pointed out "that ... it would be necessary for him to prove on the balance of probability that both the Defendants were implicated in the alleged conspiracy," that Lipstadt "was acting in league with the Anti Defamation League, the Board of Deputies of Jews and other organizations intent on targeting him."[118] Justice Gray did not consider, on the evidence placed before him, that this claim of Irving was established.[119]

To decide whether calling Irving a "Holocaust denier" constitutes libel, Justice Gray wished to know how "the notional typical reader ... would have understood the words."[120]

While I agree that our century has known many holocausts, Irving should have been aware of the commonly accepted meaning of "Holocaust denier": one who denies that National Socialist Germany murdered Jews on an industrial scale in gas chambers. In fact, Prof. Richard Evans devotes almost a hundred pages of his 740-page "expert report" to finding a suitable definition of the expression,[121] concluding it fits Irving quite well.[122]

Irving wrote in his Statement of Claim that "the true or legal innuendo of the words 'Holocaust denier' is that any person described as such wilfully perversely and with disregard to all the existing historical evidence denied and continues to deny all and any occurrence of one of the worst crimes known to history, namely the mass murder by whatever means by Hitler's agents and their associates of the Jewish people and hence genocide and hence a crime against humanity."[123]

The rest of this section will explore to what extent Irving should be regarded as a spokesperson for Holocaust revisionism, and to his responses to the arguments of his adversaries, especially those dealing with chemistry.

The trial was puzzling from the start, with Irving determined not to make this a debate about the Holocaust as such,[124] on which he is no expert[125]—

and which in any case "bores" him[126] — but to defend his reputation as an historian.[127] Yet, on the very first day Irving stated: "The most interesting part of the action in the light of history is, undoubtedly, the Holocaust and Auschwitz, and is also, I think we all apprehend, the most complicated to prepare."[128] On another day he declared "When you are an author, you are constantly receiving letters from members of the public suggesting you have got things wrong. Sometimes you ignore them.... But when you are conscientious, then you will put those objections to other people who are probably better informed than yourselves and say, 'What do you say about this?' This is precisely what I did."[129]

How well Irving was prepared for the trial and how much he followed his own advice is problematic, as we will see.

Just as the trial was getting under way, Robert Faurisson wrote: "I expect David Irving to make twists and turns and recantations. He writes and publishes too much in order to allow himself the time, beforehand, to read attentively the documents which he quotes or which the opposing side submits. If he is acquainted with the revisionist literature, it is only just barely; he cannot be considered a spokesman for historical revisionism. I have always called him 'the reluctant revisionist.' Strong in appearance, he is, in reality, fragile. His opponents will have an easy time tripping him up."[130]

In the introduction to his edition of the Leuchter Report, Irving wrote that "chemistry is an exact science ... the laboratory reports were shattering ... I myself would, admittedly, have preferred to see more rigorous methods used in identifying and certifying the samples ...".[131] And although it dealt only with Auschwitz and Majdanek, the *Report* appeared to convince him that the homicidal gas chambers of the Third Reich were a total myth[132] — except possibly for some "experimental" gas vans.[133] Whenever he spoke of the report in public, he expressed no doubts about it beyond what he had written in the introduction to his own edition of the *Leuchter Report*. Statements such as "the gas chambers that are shown to tourists in Auschwitz are fakes"[134] give the impression that the gas chambers at Birkenau are also fakes since for most people "Auschwitz" includes Auschwitz II. Irving found it easy to use such loose language when talking to admiring audiences, but it harmed his case.[135]

In 1977 David Irving touched off a lively historical controversy with the presentation, in his book *Hitler's War*, of his provocative thesis that Hitler was not responsible for the Holocaust, and hardly knew about it until quite late in the war.[136] Revisionism has since moved on and we now ask "what is it exactly that Hitler was supposed to know?" Not so for David Irving, who in this trial conceded just about every point made by the opposition, including their objections to the *Leuchter Report*, but could not help himself and returned again and again and again to the "Hitler didn't know" theme.

In my view, Irving's worst blunder was to neglect the work of Germar Rudolf, who did not appear as an expert witness.[137] Neither his own report nor his technical opinions on Van Pelt's report[138] were placed in Irving's discovery. At Irving's request Rudolf wrote a "Critique of the 'Findings on Justification' by Judge Gray," for use in a possible appeal.[139] However, nearly everything Rudolf wrote there on the chemical and physical aspects of gassing could already be found in the *Rudolf Report* and his other pre-trial writings.[140] Often trumpeted by Irving as a more thorough study than Leuchter's,[141] the *Rudolf Report* was never submitted, and this tied Gray's hands in forming his judgment. On the morning of the ninth day, Irving promised to have it couriered for the afternoon session, but it failed to arrive.[142] The next day there was a repeat of this tragicomedy as the "dozen copies" of the "glossy blue publication" that should have been handed to his Lordship were "through an oversight... not listed in discovery," for which Irving apologized.[143]

Then Robert Jan van Pelt took the stand, and defense attorney Rampton examined him on Rudolf's work, as well as on the various reports made by the Institute of Forensic Research in Cracow,[144] even though Van Pelt admitted he was far from qualified as a chemist. With regard to Rudolf's *Report*, van Pelt said that he was "vaguely familiar with it." But given that he thought it had "something like" 20 pages, van Pelt could hardly have looked at it.[145] Van Pelt said that he was "hesitant to give any kind of definite opinion," but thought that "in substance the Leuchter results were substantiated by Rudolf, which means a high level of Prussian Blue." Citing the compilers of the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute reports, he said "What I do know is that they [the Polish investigators] found that the Prussian blue test was problematic,"[146] and he proceeded to expound on the perceived merits of their 1994 report.[147]

Furthermore, had Irving been familiar with Rudolf's work,[148] he might have been able to counter van Pelt's arguments, as well as those of Dr. James Roth, who had analyzed Leuchter's samples in 1988, but who now says "I do not think that the Leuchter results have any meaning ..."[149] Moreover,

David Irving would not have reiterated again and again the "virtues" of the 1990 Cracow report, which, if accepted, logically compels one to accept the 1994 Cracow report as forensic evidence for the existence of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz.[150]

Had David Irving examined more thoroughly his doubts about the *Leuchter Report* — and made them "plain to his audiences"[151] — before the trial, instead of having his nose rubbed in them during the proceedings, he might have been in a better position to counter the rather thin arguments of his opponents. The strongest criticism of Leuchter was that he had grossly overestimated the concentration of HCN gas that would have been needed in the "homicidal gas chambers."[152] That Irving did have some doubts concerning this issue emerges from the correspondence he had in the 90's with one "Colin Beer" (probably a pseudonym), who raised this very point — causing Irving to write: "these criticisms ... have to be taken on board." Rampton reminded Irving of this. He responded: "I completely agree and you are absolutely right. There are probably concessions [which] have to be made at both ends of this scale."[153]

Although Irving held on to Leuchter's forensic chemistry, he lacked the necessary knowledge to back up his argument. When confronted with technical details he had to confess: "I am afraid I am way out of my depth there," "I am lost."[154]

Irving probably made his strongest impact with Faurisson's "No Holes, No Holocaust" reasoning. Although Justice Gray agreed that "Irving's argument deserves to be taken seriously," he also agreed with Van Pelt that the now-collapsed roofs of the "gas chambers" are too fragmentary to permit any firm conclusions, and that "it is unclear how much of the roof can be seen in the photograph on which Irving relies."[155]

Irving also pointed out that Roth was wrong in assuming that cyanide is only a "surface reaction," given that cyanide had penetrated to the outer walls of the delousing tracts. Questioned whether the outside walls had been tested, Irving answered: "Yes, by Germar Rudolf."[156]

Two days later Van Pelt acknowledged that the blue stains on the outside walls were due to cyanide.[157] With nobody an authority on the subject, it was really a case of the blind leading the blind. On day nine Van Pelt, in his discussion of the 1994 Cracow Institute report, pointed out that samples taken from blue stains on both the inside and outside walls of the building mentioned by Irving, showed "relative high readings," comparable to those from morgue number 1 of Birkenau *Krema* II. This was supposed to constitute "a positive proof that the spaces in the crematoria they had tested had been used with Zyklon B" [sic].[158] However, since Van Pelt mentioned that the Cracow Institute had not tested for Prussian Blue, what then was the point of taking samples from the "blue stains"? Not even once did Irving challenge Van Pelt's "evidence," and his ignorance of Rudolf's arguments was once again his nemesis. The heart of the matter is that the analytic methods used by the Cracow forensic institute do not pick up total cyanide, and are therefore suspect.

David Irving repeated Leuchter's challenge: "If you don't like Leuchter's results, go and do the tests yourself and prove that I am a nincompoop."[159] But in the end Irving accepted that in Birkenau "gas chamber experiments were conducted."[160]

What is one to make of Irving's statement about the "Reinhardt" camps, Belzec, Treblinka and Sobibor? "For the purposes of this trial," he said, "we are accepting that gassing did occur in those camps."[161] Was this merely a tactical manoeuvre? Asked if he accepts that "hundreds upon thousands of Jews were from ...the spring of 1942, and in Chelmno earlier, and probably Belzec, deliberately killed in Sobibor, Treblinka and Belzec," Irving responded "I think on the balance of probabilities, the answer is yes," but added that "the evidentiary basis for that statement is extremely weak." He repeated once more: "I have to keep on emphasizing I am not an expert on the Holocaust...," but agreed that hundreds of thousands were killed in those camps.[162]

Although he scored some good points on the Gerstein documents,[163] Justice Gray indicated that Irving's arguments had no real purpose because he was already "accepting that gas chambers were used [to] kill Jews in those three camps."[164]

Regarding Chelmno and the "gas vans," Irving was more explicit: "I have repeatedly allowed that [Jews] were killed in gas vans" — and he included Yugoslavia among the places where such vans were used.[165] A dramatic moment in the proceedings came when Irving was shown a document describing the gassing of 97,000 Jews in Chelmno "gas vans."[166] Although he claimed to have first seen this document only five or six months earlier, he accepted it as genuine. It showed "systematic, huge scale, using gas trucks to murder Jews."[167]

As Rampton put it in his closing speech: "Mr Irving has been driven, in the face of overwhelming evidence presented by Professor Robert Jan van Pelt, Professor Christopher Browning and Dr Longerich, to concede that there were indeed mass mur-

ders on a huge scale by means of gassing at Chelmno in the Warthegau and at the Reinhardt camps of Belzec, Treblinka and Sobibor; and even that there were 'some gassings' at Auschwitz."[168]

The Future of Revisionism

In many countries revisionists are outcasts, and their writings suppressed; in some countries questioning "the Holocaust" is a crime. In France for example, Professor Faurisson has repeatedly been convicted for so-called "Holocaust denial,"[169] as have others in Germany, including David Irving. The list grows longer and longer.[170]

Why are authorities so determined to stamp out revisionism? Some claim that the answer lies in Jewish influence, in particular in the power of the "Jewish lobby." There is much truth in this, but I believe the matter is more complex than that, even if I don't claim to have the answer. Let it be said, though, that if six million innocent men, women and children were indeed killed in cold blood only because of their birth — in other words if one accepts the standard picture of the Holocaust, with all its chilling details — then it is not so surprising that humanity's conscience should be deeply troubled, and that thinking people would want to keep the memory of it alive, especially the German leaders. "The Holocaust," it has often been said, forms the foundation stone of the Federal Republic of Germany.[171] All the same, political leaders, especially in Germany, should be aware of the dangers posed by officially sanitized truth![172] Even German judges must see the absurdity of condemning a thesis while ignoring its content. A strong hint that a condition set for German reunification by the victors of World War II was that the German authorities clamp down on revisionists can be gleaned from a 1994 *Der Spiegel* interview wth the then Interior Minister for Brandenburg, Alwin Ziel, who stated: "The Allies only allowed Germans to consider reunification on the condition that a catastrophe such as National Socialism would never again take root in Germany ... Restrictions on freedom of opinion and association, which before unification were viewed critically, are now justified. Today Germany and her basic law are different from what they were before unification."[173]

"The Holocaust," it seems, has taken on quasi-religious characteristics and, like any religion, is used and abused — by Jews as well as non-Jews — for political purposes. However, we must accept that, on the whole, the "Holocaust promotion lobby" is concerned with preserving what it perceived as truth. Let us also not forget that what did happen to Europe's Jews during World War II was dreadful enough. There cannot be any reasonable doubt about the realities of the forced deportations of millions, including the very young and the very old, of forced labor, or of anti-Jewish pogroms and massacres in the East. Surely it is a bitter irony that many talented Jews would likely have ***remained*** patriotic Germans and contributed to Germany's struggle for equality among nations, had not the regime turned against them only on account of their birth. I do not think it will ever be possible to really understand why National Socialist Germany carried out such harsh measures against Jews as a people. One day, perhaps, it might be possible to better "understand" these measures, and Irving's question is perfectly valid: "Why were the Jews so hated?" At this junction however, any insensitive approach to the problem can only harm *historical* revisionism.[174]

It is clear to me that historians should long ago have challenged the prosecution evidence at the Nuremberg trials, especially regarding the alleged systematic extermination of six million European Jews. By the 1980's at the latest, serious and respectful consideration should have been given to the revisionist critique of the Holocaust story, certainly in the wake of the arguments presented by Robert Faurisson in *Le Monde,* and of two books published in 1980, Faurisson's *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'Histoire* and *Vérité historique ou vérité politique* by Serge Thion.[175] How, then, is it that revisionist scholarship is continually subjected to ridicule and that serious revisionists are habitually vilified? While it is generally normal to be wary of, sometimes even hostile to a new idea that challenges the *status quo*, the very nature of the Holocaust issue intensifies such feelings a hundredfold, and not just among Jews. Shock waves from the Hitler period are still being felt, above all in Germany. In no other country would a head of state call his own people a nation of criminals — *ein Tätervolk*.[176]

A major impediment to revisionist views gaining legitimacy is the fact that many of revisionism's adherents often have their own, all too obvious, political-ideological agendas, which frightens off those who might otherwise be interested, even supportive. This is the "baggage" that *Skeptic* editor-publisher Michael Shermer spoke of in his July 1995 debate with Mark Weber.[177] Frequently spokespersons for revisionism (self-proclaimed or otherwise) give the impression that in their view Hitler's Germany did nothing wrong, and that the Jews were themselves ultimately responsible for their fate. Some Internet users with ill-considered,

even irrational, viewpoints are increasingly labelled "revisionist," or label themselves thus, so that the term may be losing any clear or precise meaning.

All this adds to the widely held perception that Holocaust revisionism is not serious or scholarly, and gives ammunition to those who regard revisionists as "Neo-Nazis, nostalgics and agitators."[178] What self-respecting established historian would risk being confused, let alone identified, with such persons? Of course many other factors play a role, for example the perception that questioning the Holocaust is a little like committing the crimes all over again.[179]

In order to facilitate cross-fertilization with academic historians, genuine Holocaust revisionists may ultimately have to distance themselves from those who use and abuse the, often still tentative, results of revisionist research for overt political ends. It cannot be overemphasized that for revisionism to be taken seriously, "... only publications with a content that is dry, objective, serious (*sachlich*) and demand high scientific standards can be productive", as Germar Rudolf has underscored.[180] We also have to keep in mind that only a tiny proportion of historians accepts the revisionist thesis — that is, there was no plan to exterminate the Jewish people, there were no gas chambers to carry out such a plan, and the number of Jewish dead has been vastly exaggerated. Furthermore, we need to remind ourselves that nothing is one hundred percent certain, and this also applies to Auschwitz, the camp most thoroughly studied by both sides. Although apparently based on *standard* scientific methods, Rudolf's results should not be regarded as the final word on the subject, and need to be confirmed by other competent scientists. Compared to Auschwitz, much less is known about the "purely extermination" camps (Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, Chelmno).[181] Extensive research also remains to be done on the special security police units, the *Einsatzgruppen* and the *Ordnungspolizei*,[182] on the extent to which local militia in the occupied Eastern territories were responsible for massacres,[183] and on the number of Jewish deaths,[184] and exactly how these came about.

Should Auschwitz go the way of "Jewish soap," it is obvious that many historians would consider questions on the Holocaust with a far more open mind and, in fact, find themselves forced to reexamine all aspects of that terrible period.[185]

To get to the truth, a completely open debate is needed — something that revisionists have wanted for a long time.[186] Let us hope historian Donald Cameron Watt is wrong in speculating that the Irving case "could have one undesirable outcome — to drive the Holocaust deniers underground. 'We need to have this stuff out in the open ...'"[187] As a small group that holds a dissident, minority viewpoint, our impact and importance is limited. Revisionism will only have a wider impact once it starts to filter down from recognized authorities to the public at large.[188]

There are several criteria for judging revisionist progress. The most important one will always be the quality of work published, but another is the extent to which it is accepted by historians of more general standing, and the degree to which revisionist work is acknowledged in quality journals, newspapers, and so forth.

In conclusion, let me quote Germar Rudolf's words from a statement he made in 1994: "Our challenge must be to write a comprehensive history of the persecution of the Jews during the Third Reich: one that says not merely what did not happen, but above all tells us what really did happen."[189]

Notes

1. This essay is adapted from a talk given on March 28, 1998, at a meeting in Costa Mesa, southern California, organized by the Institute for Historical Review. It was an honor to have shared, at that meeting, the platform with David Irving, the historian who first made me aware, more than 20 years ago, that not all was well with the standard account of Second World War history. I wish to thank the Institute, and especially its director Mark Weber, for this invitation and for the financial assistance afforded me, and to thank both Mark and his wife, Priscilla, for their hospitality. A very special thanks to Dr. Robert Countess and his wife Elda for their generous hospitality and for financial assistance which they procured, without which my first visit to America would have been much more difficult. Last but not least, I wish to thank Germar Rudolf for much information and for making many useful suggestions after carefully going through this text.
2. Book A. As quoted in the "Thucydides" entry in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1957 and 1959 editions.
3. Thucydides, Book A, §20, §22. I have translated "mythos" as "fiction."
4. Thucydides could not fulfill his ideal; many of the speeches he quotes at length are reconstructed, as he says himself.
5. *Intervista sull' Olocausto* (Edizioni di Ar, undated), p.11; English translation: *My Banned Holocaust Interview* (Granata, Box 2145 PVP, CA 90274, USA, 1996), p. 5.
6. Minister Nicholas Ridley expressed his horror at Britain becoming closely associated with Germany when he told journalists: "Only two months ago I was in Auschwitz ..." (*Spectator*, July 14, 1990). For the G.

Grass quote see *Die Zeit*, February 23, 1990. Expressions of the perceived ingrained brutality of Germans are frequent and widespread. See for example Luc Rosenzweig's *Le Monde* article of March 29, 1990 (*The Guardian Weekly*, April 15, 1990, p. 14), in which he asks "Could Auschwitz make reunification morally unacceptable?," *Newsweek* of March 5, 1990, in which George Will poses the question whether "there is some character trait, some national chromosome that makes Germans dangerous ...", or the article "Will German Unity Breed a Monster?" in the *Natal Mercury* of March 3, 1990.

7. Faurisson's challenge has been repeatedly made since 1978. See, for example, *Le Monde* of December 28, 1978, p. 12, "Le problème des chambres à gaz ou 'la rumour d'Auschwitz'." (Authorized translation published in "Faurisson's Three Letters to Le Monde, *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 2000, pp. 40-41.) The bankruptcy of traditional history, when it concerns the Holocaust, was manifest in 1979 when 33 historians countered Faurisson's demand for scientific proof of the alleged Nazi gas chambers with the absurd response that "such a mass murder was technically possible since it took place." ("La politique hitlérienne d'extermination: une déclaration d'historiens," *Le Monde*, February 21, 1979, p. 23). His books and articles, many of which have appeared in *The Journal of Historical Review*, are all immensely worth reading. See in particular "A challenge to David Irving," an abridged version of which is in the Winter 1984 *Journal* (Vol. 5, Nos. 2,3,4), pp. 289-305, as well as "Response to a Paper Historian" in the Spring 1986 *Journal* (Vol. 7, No. 1), pp. 21-72. One of my favorites, "How the British Obtained the Confessions of Rudolf Höss," appeared in the Winter 1986 issue (Vol. 7, No. 4), pp. 389-403. See also his article "Jean-Claude Pressac's New Auschwitz Book" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, January-February 1994 (Vol. 14, No. 1), pp. 23f.
8. See R. Faurisson, "Response to a Paper Historian" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1986 (Vol. 7, No. 1), pp. 21-72. For a revisionist view of the Frankfurt trial, see Wilhelm Stäglich's *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, published in 1990 by the IHR, a translation of *Der Auschwitz Mythos* (Grabert, 1979).
9. Article 19 of the IMT Charter states that "the Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence. It shall adopt and apply to the greatest possible extent expeditious and non-technical procedure, and it shall admit any evidence which it deems to have probative value." Article 21 states that "the Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge but shall take judicial notice thereof. It shall also take judicial notice of official government documents and reports of the United Nations ..."
10. See the *Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal* (Nuremberg, Germany, 1947-1949; 42 vols.). For some of the more absurd accusations made at the Nuremberg IMT, see Carlos W. Porter's *Made in Russia: The Holocaust* (Historical Review Press, 1988). Porter's book is reviewed by Theodore J. O'Keefe in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1989 (Vol. 9, No. 1), pp. 89-95. A CD containing the complete official records of the Nuremberg trials has been produced by James Joseph Sanchez: *Nuremberg War Crimes Trial Online* (Copyright 1995 Aristarchus Knowledge Industries, PO Box 45610, Seattle, WA 98105, USA). It contains the 42-volume IMT "blue series." the eleven-volume "red series" *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (NCA), the Nuremberg Military Tribunal (NMT) "green series," and the Final Report to the Secretary of the Army (TTFR). This useful tool for researchers is available from the IHR (P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA).
11. RIF stood for *Reichsstelle für Industrielle Fettversorgung* ("Reich Center for Industrial Fat Provisioning"), and not, as some have alleged, for *Rein Jüdisches Fett* ("Pure Jewish Fat"), which should in any case have been abbreviated as "RJF," not "RIF." See "Jewish Soap" by Mark Weber in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 2), pp. 217-227. In addition to submitting samples of "human soap" (IMT exhibit USSR-393), the Soviet prosecution also presented a sample of untested "semi-tanned human skin" (USSR-394).
12. IMT "blue series," Vol. 6, p. 213, Vol. 7, pp. 376, 377, 576, 577, 586, Vol. 12, p. 369, Vol. 19, pp. 598-599, Vol. 32, pp. 153-158. A striking absurdity is the "confession" of SS man Paul Waldmann (IMT document USSR-52), who claimed that 840,000 Soviet prisoners of war were killed at Sachsenhausen, and described a bizarre foot-operated device used there to kill prisoners by bashing their heads. See Carlos W. Porter's *Made in Russia: The Holocaust*, pp. 14-16, 378-380, and Sanchez, pp. 10343-10350, 10946-10953, 33733-33744.
13. On the first (1985) Zündel trial see *The Great Holocaust Trial* by Michael A. Hoffman II (2nd edition, IHR, 1985), or the "Expanded, Third Commemorative Edition," Wiswell Ruffin House (PO Box 236, Dresden, New York 14441), 1995 which includes, among other things, a brief description of Zündel's second (1988) trial. In spite of often loaded language (for example, needlessly labeling Sabina Citron, the person who brought charges against Zündel, as a "commissar"), the booklets contain invaluable information. To mention only one example, at the first trial, Raul Hilberg, author of a "standard work" on the Holocaust, *The Destruction of the European Jews: Revised and Definitive Edition* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), and widely regarded as the world's foremost Holocaust authority, was forced to admit under cross-examination that there is no scientific evidence to support allegations of German wartime mass gassings. Asked about a Hitler order to exterminate the Jews, he tied himself in knots assert-

ing that Hitler "wanted the Jewish Bolshevik commissars liquidated" — something quite different. Hoffman quotes Hilberg from a 1983 speech, as reported by *Newsday* of February 23, 1983: "Thus came about not so much a plan [to exterminate the Jews] being carried out, but an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus; mind-reading by a far-flung bureaucracy." (*The Great Holocaust Trial*, third edition, pp. 51-54). In the first (1961) edition of *The Destruction of the European Jews,* Hilberg maintained that there were two Hitler orders to exterminate the Jews. There are no such claims in the 1985 "Definitive Edition". See also Robert Faurisson, "The Zündel Trials (1985 and 1988)," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1988-89 (Vol. 8, No. 4), pp. 417-431.

14. See Barbara Kulaszka, ed., *Did Six Million Really Die: Report of the Evidence in the Canadian "False News" Trial of Ernst Zündel — 1988* (Samisdat Publishers, 206 Carlton St., Toronto, M5A 2L1, Canada, 1992; Available from the IHR). Shorter, but worth consulting is Robert Lenski's *The Holocaust on Trial: The Case of Ernst Zündel* (Decatur, Alabama: Reporter Press, 1989), also available from the IHR.
15. See for example Jean-Claude Pressac's lengthy work, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, commissioned and published 1989 by the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation. In it (p. 15) Pressac states that "over 95 percent" was used for non-homicidal, sanitation purposes. Raul Hilberg, in an interview by the French paper *Le Nouvel Observateur* ("Le document de la semaine," July 3, 1982, pp. 70-76) was asked why he thought Zyklon B was used for mass murder and not just for disinfestation purposes. "Not in such quantities," he replied, adding "of course, they also disinfected some clothing," while he was unsure if the same gas chambers were used for both purposes! (p. 76). When one realizes that this interview was aimed at discrediting Faurisson, it is scandalous that a historian who claims to specialize in the Holocaust could be so ignorant of such a basic matter.
16. The full report, *An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland prepared for Ernst Zündel, April 5, 1988* by Fred A. Leuchter, Jr. with a foreword by Robert Faurisson is available from Samisdat Publishers (Toronto). An abridged or summary version is available from the IHR.
17. For information on this and Leuchter's arrest in Germany, see his articles "Witch Hunt in Boston" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1990 (Vol. 10, No. 4), pp. 453-460 and "Is There Life After Persecution?" the Winter 1992 issue (Vol. 10, No. 4), pp. 429-444, as well as M. Weber's article "Fred Leuchter: Courageous Defender of Historical Truth" in that same Winter 1990 *Journal* issue, pp. 421-428.
18. See the review "Flawed Documentary of Execution Expert" by Greg Raven in *The Journal of Historical Review*, September-December 1999 (Vol. 18, No. 5/6), pp. 62-69. Nearly all mainstream reviews of the film have been very critical of Leuchter and Holocaust revisionists. For example, Scott Timberg's "Unwanted Thoughts," in the *New Times Los Angeles Online*, Dec. 23-29, 1999, and Simon Hattenstone's "When it comes to killing, this man knows it all," in the British *Guardian*, October 22, 1999, which describes Leuchter's trip to Auschwitz as "horrifying," presumably because he took samples from the "gas chambers." Cyber-activists like Ingrid Rimland at <http://www.zundelsite.org>, Russ Granata at <http://www.codoh.com/granata> and Michael Hoffman at <http://www.hoffman-info.com/> have informed their readers by e-mail about media reports, often adding comments of their own. In her reports of September 19 and 21, 1999, Rimland claimed that the Morris documentary was "the biggest breakthrough, next to the two Great Holocaust Trials of 1985 and 1988 and the cyberwar of 1996 around the Zündelsite," and that it "will change the course of Revisionism." This seems like hyperbole. In an e-mail of December 11, 1999, Granata mentioned how he had the opportunity to publicly challenge Morris (who considers Leuchter to be "insane") about a second version of "Mr. Death." After a showing at Harvard, Morris found "something very disturbing" according to "Unwanted Thoughts" by Steve Dewall in the *New Times Los Angeles* of December 23-31, 1999: "Some of the students were convinced by Leuchter and started to wonder if the Holocaust had ever happened, while others thought that Morris was convinced by Leuchter and thought the Holocaust had never happened. It was here that Morris turned to several historians and Holocaust activists for balance." "People bought into Fred's story, hook, line and, sinker... That response was unacceptable," according to Hal Niedzviecki writing in the *National Post* of January 29, 2000, pp. B1, B6. So, in the new version, according to Jennifer Rosenberg, "the documentary is not solely the voice of Leuchter but also of Ernst Zündel, David Irving, Leuchter's estranged wife, James Roth (laboratory manager of Alpha Analytical Laboratories), Robert Jan Van Pelt (co-author [with D. Dwork] of *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present*), Shelly Shapiro (Director of the Holocaust Survivors and Friends Education Center), and Suzanne Tabasky (founding member of the Malden Holocaust Commission). These and other people discuss Leuchter's 'findings'" (See http:// history1900s.about.com/education/,Dateline January 24, 2000).
19. See Pressac's magnum opus *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (New York: The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1989), as well as Shelly Shapiro (ed.), *Truth Prevails. Demolishing Holocaust Denial: The End of the "Leuchter Report,"* (The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1990), especially the chapter by Pressac, with its additional notes, "The Deficiencies and Inconsistencies of the 'Leuchter Report'," pp. 31-73. For a review of this book see Mark Weber's

essay, "Book-Length 'Scholarly' Polemic Fails to Discredit Leuchter," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1992 (Vol. 12, No. 4), pp. 485-492. For reviews and critiques of Pressac's *Auschwitz,* see Mark Weber's article in *The Journal of Historical Review* (Summer 1990 (Vol. 10, No. 2), pp. 231-237), which concludes that "in spite of its defects, [Pressac's book] is an important and enlightening work, even if not for the reasons intended by either the author or the publishers." See also Carlo Mattogno's article, "J.-C. Pressac and the War Refugee Board Report," in the Winter 1990-91 *Journal* (Vol. 10, No. 4), pp. 461-485; the extensive two-part critique by Robert Faurisson, "Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers, or, Improvised Gas Chambers & Casual Gassings at Auschwitz & Birkenau According to J.C. Pressac (1989)" in the Spring 1991 *Journal* (Vol. 11, No. 1), pp. 25-66. and Summer 1991 *Journal* (Vol. 11, No. 2), pp. 133-175. This is followed in the same *Journal* issue by Enrique Aynat's "Neither Trace Nor Proof: The Seven Auschwitz 'Gassing' Sites According to Jean-Claude Pressac," pp. 177-206. Arthur R. Butz's essay, "Some Thoughts on Pressac's Opus," is in the May-June 1993 *Journal* (Vol. 13, No. 3), pp. 23-37. Robert Faurisson responded briefly to Pressac's later book, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz: la machinerie du meurtre de masse* (CRNS, France, 1993; (German edition: *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz: Die Technik der Massemordes*, Piper, 1994) in *The Journal of Historical Review*, January-February 1994 (Vol. 14, No. 1), pp. 23-24: "Jean-Claude Pressac's New Auschwitz Book". A fuller rebuttal is Faurisson's *Réponse à Jean-Claude Pressac*, (R.H.R. (1994), B.P. 122, 92704 Colombes Cedex, France). This appears in German translation in the anthology *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten: Eine Erwiderung an Jean-Claude Pressac*, which also includes contributions by Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno and Serge Thion (Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, ed. Herbert Verbeke, Postbus 60, B-2600 Berchem, Belgium, 1996 (online: http:// www.vho.org/ D/anf/AR.html). The introduction by Germar Rudolf ("Ernst Gauss") is dated May 15, 1995, a month before Rudolf was sentenced by a Stuttgart Court to 14 months imprisonment. A critique by Serge Thion of Pressac's second book on Auschwitz, "A French Scholar Responds to Widely Acclaimed anti-Revisionist Work about Auschwitz," appeared in *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1994 (Vol. 14, No. 4), pp. 28-39. Another response to Pressac's second book is Carlo Mattogno's "The Crematories of Auschwitz: a Critique of J.-C. Pressac," in the November-December 1994 *Journal* (Vol. 14, No. 6), pp. 34-42. Mattogno's more complete response, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend,* is available from the IHR.

20. Pressac states that 0.3 gm per cubic meter of air "is immediately fatal" for humans as opposed to 5 gm applied for at least 10 hours for lice. He then claims that "40 times the lethal dose ... killed without fail one thousand people in less than five minutes." *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, p. 53. On p. 63 of *Truth Prevails* Pressac gives figures of at least 12 hours per day for delousing and "5 to 10 minutes [of gassing] every day or two" for killing humans.
21. *Truth Prevails*, p. 44.
22. On p. 66 of *Truth Prevails* Pressac proposes a totally unjustified explanation for the absence of cyanide in Leuchter's sample No. 5 (taken from the 'gas chamber' of *Krema* II): "... an accomplice could have slipped him — or could have already planted — a 'harmless' piece of brick .... In this case the temptation to practice deception was too much."
23. *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (1989), p. 59.
24. Dr. William B. Lindsey, for 33 years a research chemist with the Dow Chemical company, testified at the first Zündel trial that in his opinion, homicidal mass gassing with Zyklon B was an impossibility. (See *The Great Holocaust Trial*, 3rd edition, pp. 65, 85). He also authored the excellent article "Zyklon B and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1983 (Vol. 4, No. 3), pp. 261-303.
25. *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, p. 53.
26. *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1992-93 (Vol. 12, No. 4), pp. 445-473. Paul Grubach, in an open letter of December 22, 1991, to Michael Shermer (editor of *Skeptic* magazine) was highly critical of the latter's treatment of Holocaust Revisionism in *Why People Believe Weird Things: Pseudoscience, Superstition & Other Confusions of Our Time* (New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1997). *Skeptic* magazine, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1994), has a "Special Section on Pseudohistory" aimed at discrediting Holocaust revisionism (pp. 32-87).
27. "An Official Polish Report on the Auschwitz Gas Chambers" appeared in translation in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 1), pp. 207-216. This report was also published in part in *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (*DGG*), Vol. 39 (1991), No. 2, pp.18-19 and on p. 48 of *Historische Tatsachen*, No. 50 (1991). Online it can be seen at http:// www.vho.org/ D/DGG/IDN39_2.html.
28. *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* ("Lectures on Contemporary History"), (Tübingen: Grabert Verlag, 1993), pp. 180f. The book has recently been banned in Germany: see Grabert's *Euro-Kurier* of June 2000. It is available online at: http://www.vho.org/D/vuez/v1.html Also, an English-language edition is in preparation by Thesis and Dissertation Press in "Holocaust Handbooks Series," under the title: Ernst Gauss / Germar Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust. Points at Issue Cross-Examined*. See the website http:// tadp.org.
29. "The Lüftl Report," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1992 (Vol. 12, No. 4), pp. 391-420 (p. 418).
30. This challenge is unfortunately not in the printed

version, "The Leuchter Report: The How and the Why" (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1989, pp. 133-139) but can be heard on the audio recording of his talk, available from the IHR. The same challenge is repeated by Faurisson in the January-February 1994 *Journal of Historical Review* (Vol. 14, No. 1), p. 24.

31. Wilhelm Schlesiger (ed.), *Der Fall Rudolf*, London: Cromwell Press, 1994, pp. 6f. This text is also online at vho.org/D/ Fall.html, where one will also find an English translation.
32. *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte*, p. 181.
33. *Der Fall Rudolf*, p. 7.
34. These criminal offenses, *Volksverhetzung*, *Verunglimpfung* and *Aufstachelung zum Rassenhaß* , are laid out in Sections 130, 189 and 131 respectively of the German Penal Code. For information on Remer see: "My Role in Berlin on July 20, 1944" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1988 (Vol. 8, No. 3), pp. 41-53; "Otto-Ernst Remer Sentenced to 22 Months Imprisonment for Revisionist Publications," March-April 1993 *Journal* (Vol. 13, No. 2), pp. 29-30; "Remer Evades Imprisonment for 'Thought Crime'," May-June 1994 *Journal* (Vol. 14, No. 3), pp. 42-43; "Remer Seeks Asylum in Spain," July-August 1995 *Journal* (Vol. 15, No. 4), pp. 33-34, and, "Remer Dies in Exile," January-February 1998 *Journal* (Vol. 17, No. 1), pp. 7-9.
35. *Der Fall Rudolf*, p.7. See also the *Journal* articles on Remer, cited above.
36. The authorized (first) edition: *Das Rudolf Gutachten: Gutachten über die Bildung und Nachweisbarkeit von Cyanidverbindungen in den 'Gaskammern' von Auschwitz*, Rüdiger Kammerer, Armin Solms (Hg.) ("Expert Report on the Formation and Detectability of Cyanide Compounds in the 'Gas Chambers' of Auschwitz," Rüdiger Kammerer, Armin Solms (editors)), Cromwell Press (London), 1993. For a brief review of Rudolf's *Report* see "Three Revisionist Books from Germany: The Rudolf Report" and "Valuable "Lectures" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, November-December 1993 (Vol. 13, No. 6), pp. 25-26. Udo Walendy commented on the *Report* in *Historische Tatsachen*, No. 60 (1993): "Naturwissenchaft ergänzt Geschichtsforschung." There is also a 16-page "summary" edition in German (which is really an unauthorized commentary on the report) and its translation into English: *The Rudolf Report* (Cromwell, 1993), available from the IHR. To the best of my knowledge, the full report has so far been translated only into French and Dutch. An English edition is in preparation as volume 2 in the "Holocaust Handbooks Series" by Thesis and Dissertation Press: Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report. Witch Hunting Germar Rudolf for his Research about Auschwitz*. Its website http://tadp.org announces its publication by the end of 2000. The report is regularly updated online at vho.org/D/rga/rga.html, and a second German edition should soon be available from Castle Hill Publishes, PO Box 118, Hastings TN34 3ZQ, England, UK. The first review of the *Rudolf Report*, "Le Rapport Rudolf" was written by Célestin Loos and appeared in the French revisionist journal *Revue d'histoire révisionniste* (*RHR*), No. 6, May 1992, pp. 9-21. On April 11, 1997, the *Journal Officiel de la Republique francaise* announced the banning of the French edition of the *Rudolf Report*, which had been published by Vrij Historisch Onderzoek (VHO), and also distributed by La Vieille Taupe. See Serge Thion's electronic release of April 20, 1997, of Le Temps irreparable. See also the French scientific review *La Recherche* of July-August 1997 (No. 300), a German translation of which appeared in *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (*VffG*), December 1997 (Vol. 1, No. 4), pp. 223-225. *La Recherche* has a declaration by the members of the chemistry division of the French Academy of Scientists: "This work [Rudolf's report] is a remarkable example of the perversion of science; it is only of interest at the psychological level but is clearly dangerous because of its serious appearance." This is very reminiscent of the 1979 anti-Faurisson declaration issued by 33 historians (mentioned above). Personally, I am surprised that it has taken historians (including some revisionists) so long to recognize the full significance of Rudolf's report.
37. This long-term stability of Prussian Blue was testified to by Dr. James Roth, laboratory manager at Alpha Analytical Laboratories, at the second Zündel trial. See Barbara Kulaszka, ed., *Did Six Million Really Die?* (1992), pp. 362f. In the later version of Morris's film "Mr. Death," Roth understands things differently.As a result, Michael Shermer of *Skeptic* magazine challenged Rudolf with this new angle as follows: "Leuchter chipped off huge chunks of concrete and brick and ground up the entire chunks into powder when they were analyzed (or, more to the point, the chemist whom he gave the samples to did because Leuchter didn't tell him what they were), thereby diluting the Zyklon-B traces by hundreds of thousands of times. As you must know, Zyklon-B gas only penetrates about 10 microns into concrete (a human hair, by comparison, is 100 microns thick).What was your procedure for controlling this problem?" (Sent by SKEPTICMAG@aol.com on March 12, 2000, and re-transmitted by Russ Granata). Rudolf responded the next day as follows: "Please read my reply to Prof. van Pelt, posted at ... Search for 'Roth' to see my response to his *utmost reputation-wrecking nonsense*. This stuff is out there for a long time. Even the reply to van Pelt is nothing but a rearrangement of the stuff posted on www.vho.org/D/rga and other material posted on the internet for more than two years. The same material was published in printed form in 1993 and 1994, and some of it even much earlier. I am not willing to repeat myself endlessly. Should you and your folks continue to ignore the facts and opinions of others, then this

proves your pseudo-scientific behavior. Period."

38. Carlo Mattogno discovered a Zyklon B variant, patented in 1926 and which released practically all its HCN gas within 10 minutes but nobody seems to know whether this product was ever used. Since the sources cited by Rudolf indicate that it takes about two hours before 80 percent of the HCN is released from its carrier material, Rudolf's arguments could well be adversely affected if it is shown that the 1926 variant came into use. See section 5.4 of the chapter "Die 'Gaskammern' von Auschwitz und Majdanek" by G. Rudolf (and "Ernst Gauss") in the anthology *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte: Ein Handbuch über strittige Fragen des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, Grabert, 1994). It is posted on the vho web site, and an expanded version has been published in English under the title *Dissecting the Holocaust. The Growing Critique of 'Truth' and 'Memory.'* (Thesis and Dissertation Press, P.O. Box 64, Capshaw, Alabama 35742, USA: 2000). This work is available from the IHR. See also the web site http://www.tadp.org. Chemist Dr. Wolfgang Lambrecht gives a detailed description of how the features of Zyklon B changed between 1925 and 1943 — leading to an increased rate of evaporation — in *VffG,* March 1997 (Vol. 1, No. 1), pp. 2-5; online in the vho.org web site. The *VffG* journal is edited and produced by Germar Rudolf (P.O. Box 118, Hastings TN34 3ZQ, England, UK).
39. *Kremas* II and III were mirror-images of each other. Each had a had *Leichenkeller* (morgue) 1 and 2, labeled as such on the original plans, first discovered and published by Robert Faurisson.
40. In order to avoid bias one way or the other, such a procedure is scientifically (and ethically) correct. Nevertheless, the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science, in a press release dated May 25, 1993, implicitly criticized Rudolf for withholding such information from the Fresenius Institute; Rudolf in turn castigated the Society in an open letter for its generally unscientific approach in matters pertaining to the Holocaust. See *Der Fall Rudolf*, pp. 15ff.
41. See the Rudolf's report, §6.6, "Gutachten Krakau," pp.105-106 and *Vorlesungen*, §3.10, "Die Ergebnisse des Krakauer Gutachtens," pp. 182-184. The analytical method used by the Fresenius Laboratories was that of the standard DIN (Deutsches Institut für Normung/German Institute for Standardization) 35 405/ D14; the Jan Sehn Institute used a method due to J. Epstein (*Analytical Chemistry* 19(1947), pp. 272f). The 1994 article by the Jan Sehn Institute was inspired by J. Bailer's chapter "Der Leuchter-Bericht aus der Sicht eines Chemikers," ("The Leuchter Report From the Viewpoint of a Chemist") in the anti-revisionist anthology *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit* ("Running Amok Against Reality"), eds., Dokumentationszentrum des österreichischen Widerstandes, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kultur (Vienna 1991), pp. 47-52. Since Bailer found it difficult to believe that Prussian Blue could form in bricks exposed to HCN, the Jan Sehn Institute took up the cue and referred to the blue on the walls of the delousing chambers as the "controversial blue dye." See below on the 1994 report.
42. The later, 1994 Cracow Institute report is discussed below.
43. Werner Wegner contributed an extensive critique of the *Leuchter Report*, "Keine Vergasung in Auschwitz? Zur Kritik des Leuchter-Gutachtens" in the anthology *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit — Impulse zur Historisierung des Nationalsozialismus*, edited by U. Backes, E. Jesse and R. Zitelmann (Ullstein, 1992), pp. 450-476. Wilhelm Stäglich, author of *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence* (IHR, 1985) has also written a critique of Wegner, *The Leuchter Report: Reply to a Critique* (History Buff Books, undated).
44. In 1995 the Viennese publisher Deuticke brought out *Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge,* edited by Brigitte Bailer-Galanda, Wolfgang Benz and Wolfgang Neugebauer. (Now out of print, it has been superseded by *Die Auschwitzleugner* [Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1996], with the same editors.) In his contribution, "Die 'Revisionisten' und die Chemie" ("The 'Revisionists' and Chemistry"), J. Bailer takes to task both F. Berg and G. Rudolf. Rudolf responded with "Zur Kritik an 'Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge'," in the collection of his essays, *Kardinalfragen: Eine Sammlung kontroverser Stellungnahmen von Germar Rudolf alias Ernst Gauss zum herrschenden Zeitgeist in Wissenschaft, Politik, Justiz und Medien* (Ed. Herbert Verbeke, Stiftung Vrij Historische Onderzoek, 1996 (online in German and English at www.vho.org/D/ Kardinal), pp. 91-108. In his contribution to *Die Auschwitzleugner* (pp. 130-152), Bailer continues to doubt that the presence of Prussian Blue in the delousing chambers has anything to do with the application of Zyklon B. Finally, he insists that the two phenomena are unrelated (p. 149). This contradicts the opinions of both Pressac (as we have seen), and the chemist Richard J. Green. (See the section below on the 1994 report of the Jan Sehn Forensic Institute.)
45. G. Jagschitz gave expert evidence in the trial of Austrian Gerd Honsik. See p.106 of Rudolf's report and n. 59 for details.
46. In his response to J. Bailer's criticism that only iron unfavorable to the formation of Prussian Blue (trivalent iron Fe^{3+} instead of divalent Fe^{2+}) exists in bricks and slaked lime, Rudolf points out that the CN-ion itself acts as a reduction agent — converting Fe^{3+} to Fe^{2+}, the CN-ion itself thereby losing its negative charge — especially in an alkaline ambience, bringing about the right conditions for the formation of stable cyanide compounds. See also *Vorlesungen*, pp. 290-299. For an elementary account of oxidation/ reduction processes see K. M. Mackay and R.A. Mackay, *Introduction to Modern Inorganic Chemistry* (4^{th} edition, Prentice Hall, 1989), especially §2.17.
47. Rudolf refers to this "migration" as an *Anreicherung-*

sprozess or "enrichment process".

48. See in particular the color photographs in *Dissecting the Holocaust* (Capshaw, Alabama: 2000), between pages 368 and 369. These remarkable photos are also published in *Vorlesungen*, pp. 186-188 (photos 3.3-3.5), and in *Das Rudolf Gutachten* (1993), pp. 87-90, as well as on the back cover of the English summary version, *The Rudolf Report*. Robert Faurisson has emphasized the lack of blue stains in the "homicidal gas chambers" (in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1991, pp. 38f), but it should be noted that an inner wall of the delousing chamber in building BW 5b at Birkenau shows no such stains, though it is rich in cyanide compounds. See samples 19a and 19b in *The Rudolf Report*, and in *Vorlesungen*, p. 192. In a private communication Rudolf informed me that the color blue is present only very near the surface, and is perhaps only 100 µm thick. It accumulated there due to water-diffusion, carrying with it soluble cyanide compounds. In BW 5b (sample 19a) this transport process failed because the contact between plaster and wall was poor, preventing any ground water from diffusing to the surface since it evaporated between plaster layers. The result was that the upper plaster layers fell off, as can be seen in the delousing tract of this building.
49. See sample 25 in the *Rudolf Report*, tables 15 and 16, pp. 84f, and the discussion in § 4.3.3.4, pp. 91ff. Apparently the presence of calcium (in the form of lime/carbonates) can simulate the presence of small quantities of cyanide, so that concentrations of under 10 mg/kg detected by standard DIN methods may not be meaningful. See also *Vorlesungen*, §3.8, pp.175ff and §3.12 (Kontrollanalysen), pp.194ff. Some of Rudolf's samples were also analyzed by the Institut für Umweltanalytik, Stuttgart (IUS). The results of the two chemical analyses of sample 11 taken from an inner-wall of BW 5a differed considerably: The Fresenius institute found 2640 mg/kg of CN-content, while IUS found 1430 mg/kg, showing how careful one should be about using figures. For the "farmhouse" sample 25, both laboratories gave exactly the same concentration.
50. In the introduction to the *Leuchter Report*, Robert Faurisson writes: "The extremely low levels of cyanide found in some crematoria was likely, in my opinion, to have resulted from disinfection of the premises during the war."
51. "Only products such as diluted cresyl, bleach, or gaseous formaldehyde are currently used for this [disinfecting] purpose": *Truth Prevails*, p. 62.
52. *Rudolf Report*, pp. 98-99.
53. These "bunkers" are said to have been two farmhouses just outside Birkenau, in which people were allegedly gassed. An important "eyewitness" to a gassing was the former SS man Richard Böck, who stated that he saw a blue haze coming from the "gas chamber" after the doors were opened. The fact is that HCN gas is colorless, and so cannot be seen. At David Irving's first "Real History" meeting of September 26, 1999 (Cincinnati, Ohio), Russ Granata reported that Carlo Mattogno "affirms that so-called Bunkers 1 and 2 never existed." See R. Granata's "open letter to Yehuda Bauer" of February 16, 2000 on the Internet, as well as the video "Russ Granata Reports on Carlo Mattogno," available from Granata, P.O. Box 2145 PVP, CA 90274, USA. For a more detailed critique of Böck's testimony, see the *Rudolf Report*, pp. 63f.
54. I have slightly paraphrased Rudolf here.
55. The authors — Jan Markiewicz, Wojcieh Gubala, Jerzy Labedz of the Instytut Ekspertyz Sadowych im. Prof. dra Jana Sehna, PL 31-003 Krakow, ul. Westerplatte 9, Poland — published "A study of the Cyanide Compounds Content in the Walls of the Gas Chambers in the Former Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps" in *Z Zagadnien Nauk Sadowych*, z. XXX, 1994, pp. 17-27. This can be seen online at www2.ca.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/orgs/polish/institute-for-forensic-research/post. Rudolf informs me that the deceased first author was not a chemist.
56. The three Polish authors wrote: "J. Bailer writes in ... 'Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit' [cited above] that the formation of Prussian Blue in bricks is simply improbable; however he takes into consideration the possibility that the walls of the delousing room were coated with this dye as paint. We decided therefore to determine the cyanide ions using a method that does not induce the breakdown of the composed ferum cyanide complex (this is the blue under consideration) ..."
57. See "Leuchter-Gegengutachten: ein wissenschaftlicher Betrug?," first published in *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Tübingen), Vol. 43 (1995), No. 1, pp. 22-26, and is reprinted in the 1996 anthology *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 81-85. Rudolf points out there that 99.9 percent of the compounds present in the walls of the delousing chambers are undetectable by the method used by the Jan Sehn Institute. See also Rudolf's exchange of letters with the Cracow Institute, "Briefwechsel mit dem Jan-Sehn-Institut Krakau," first published in *Sleipnir* (Berlin), Vol. 3, 1995, pp. 29-33, and reprinted in *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 86-90. See especially the section "Stellungnahme zur Krakauer Erwiderung," pp. 87-86. Rudolf points out that the methods used by the Jan Sehn Institute cannot be reconciled with those of Alpha Analytic Laboratories, the Institut Fresenius or the Institut für Umwelt-und Schadstoffanalytik. Unlike Leuchter and Rudolf, the Polish researchers did not give their samples to an independent laboratory for analysis, but kept the whole exercise "within the family," a most unscientific approach.
58. On March 21, 1996, I wrote a detailed letter to the authors, querying this very point: "On p. 20 of your study you cite J. Bailer ... as stating that 'the walls of the delousing room' may have been 'coated with this dye as paint.' What does 'this dye' refer to? Is it a

paint based on Prussian Blue, as you seem to suggest on p. 20 where you write that 'this is the blue under discussion'? You state that 'it is hard to imagine the chemical reactions ... that would have led to the formation of Prussian Blue in that place', and quote Bailer who says that the 'formation of Prussian Blue in bricks is simply improbable.' Did you not write to Werner Wegner, saying *die blauen Flecken auf den äusseren Wänden des Bauwerkes 5a in Birkenau sind nicht leicht zu erklären. Vor allem müssen wir prüfen, ob es wirklich Berliner-Blau ist*? ['the blue patches on the outside walls of BW 5a are not easy to explain. First of all, we must test if it is really Prussian Blue"].Your article is very ambiguous about this. How can Rudolf have 'confirmed the high concentrations of cyanogen compounds' when at the same time you express reservations with phrases such as 'this may be so' (p. 18)? You claim that the 'blue dye' is 'controversial' while making no effort whatsoever to settle the very simple question: is it Prussian Blue or not? In my opinion this problem should have been properly settled right at the beginning of your study. If, for example, the blue in the outer walls of the delousing chambers of BW 5a and 5b is due to the presence of Prussian Blue, then there would be no need to accuse Rudolf of indulging in "*wissenschaftliche Spekulationen*." No reply to this letter has been received.

59. Rudolf found this information in a journal specializing in the study of damage to buildings. See "Leuchter-Gegengutachten: ein wissenschaftlicher Betrug?" in *Kardinalfragen zur Zeitgeschichte*, p. 82, and note 7 for the source.
60. See "Leuchter, Rudolf & the Iron Blues" as well as "The Chemistry of Auschwitz" at the vho website. Rudolf's most recent article in this matter, a refutation of an article written by the Richard E. Green, was presented at the first Australian Revisionist Conference held by the Adelaide Institute on August 9, 1998: "Some considerations about the 'Gas Chambers' of Auschwitz and Birkenau." Here Rudolf explains why he thinks the Jan Sehn Institute's analytic methods amount to fraud. This is likewise posted on the vho web site: http://www.vho.org.
61. "Danger in Denying Holocaust?," a front-page (p. A-1) article by veteran journalist Kim Murphy appeared in the *Los Angeles Times*, January 7, 2000. It began "A young German chemist named Germar Rudolf took crumbling bits of plaster...," and went on to state that compared with the delousing chambers "there was up to a thousand times less in the rooms described as human gas chambers." Murphy also wrote that Rudolf "could be called as a witness" at the forthcoming Irving-Lipstadt trial. For more about Kim Murphy, and her *Los Angeles Times* report on the 13th IHR Conference, see the May-June 2000 *Journal of Historical Revie*w, p. 2-3.
62. "Holocaust Deniers," *Los Angeles Times*, letters page, January 16, 2000.
63. In an e-mail letter to Zimmerman of January 19, 2000, Rudolf wrote: "In 1994/ 95 I proved that the 1994 Cracow expertise [report] about cyanide residues is at least biased, if not a serious attempt at fraud. As a member of www.holocaust-history.org you know this because you are aware of the exchange between R. J. Green and me. Ignoring that makes you an accomplice of these frauds. You are right regarding the principle difference in the time required to gas lice and humans (though one has to argue about the actual values). But you ignore the factors that made it much more likely that long-term stable cyanide residues would form in the cold underground morgues of Krema II and III rather than in the heated ground-floor delousing chambers (humidity, kind of material). You ignore the fact that wide parts of the under-ground morgue 1 of Krema II, the allegedly most frequently used 'gas chamber,' are fairly well intact and protected by environmental influences." Zimmerman believed he dealt revisionism a mortal blow with his article "Body Disposal at Auschwitz: The End of Holocaust Denial," at holocaust-history.org. Carlo Mattogno has tentatively answered Zimmerman with "Preliminary Observations," posted on Russ Granata's site, where Granata also announces Mattogno's two-volume work to be published by Edizioni di Ar in 2000: *I forni crematori di Auschwitz. Studio storico-tecnico, con la collaborazione del dott.ing. Franco Deana,* comprising 500 pages of text, 270 documents, and 360 photographs. An extensive reply to Zimmerman, in English (and Italian) is on Granata's website: "Supplementary Response to John C. Zimmerman on his 'Body Disposal at Auschwitz'."
64. Robert Faurisson has expressed the view that of the three reports confirming Leuchter's findings (the 1990 Cracow, Rudolf's and Lüftl's) the "most stunning" was this Cracow report. (See B. Kulaszka's *Did Six Million Really Die?,* p. V.) Leuchter has expressed a similar opinion: "It should be noted that a recent study by the Polish Forensics Institute has confirmed my findings of no gas residue at the alleged Auschwitz Gas Chamber" in *The Fourth Leuchter Report*, Fred A. Leuchter Associates, Inc., p.25. There are a number of other passages in *The Fourth Report* where, in my opinion, Leuchter comes to conclusions too hastily and without supporting his claims with references to authorities. Thus in paragraph 8.008 he accepts without expressing any reservations Arthur Butz's original interpretation of *Vergasungskeller*, as "carburetion cellar." Butz himself has clearly not been happy with this view: "The Nagging 'Gassing cellar' Problem," *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1997 (Vol. 16, No. 4), pp. 20-23). In paragraph 8.010 of *The Fourth Report* Leuchter makes dogmatic assertions about the 10 *Gasprüfer* 'discovered' as a 'criminal trace' by Pressac. Again, other interpretations are possible. See Butz's "A 'Criminal Trace'? Gas Detectors in Auschwitz Crematory II," in the September-October 1997 (Vol. 16, No. 5) *Journal*,

pp. 24-30. Leuchter's suggested explanation in paragraph 8.033 of a note written by a foreman working in *Krema* IV that made reference to a gas chamber may cause some to laugh, but will contribute little to history: "Perhaps he [the foreman working in Krema IV who had noted *betonieren in GassKammer* [sic] or someone in his crew was flatulent ... He may have put this in his daily report as a joke".

65. See "In der Bundesacht: Die Entrechtung unliebsamer Bürger" in the collection *Kardinalfragen*, p. 54 and n.28.. For further details see "Die Rolle der Presse im Fall Germar Rudolf," pp. 65-73 and n.16 in *Kardinalfragen*. For a rebuttal of the anti-revisionist collection *Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge* edited by Brigitte Bailer-Galanda, Wolfgang Benz and Wolfgang Neugebauer (Deuticke, Vienna, 1991 and 1992) see Rudolf's article "Zur Kritik an "Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge"" in *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 91-108.
66. See *Der Fall Rudolf*, pp.7-11 (interview with *Journal* contributor Fritz Berg), where one will also find interesting material on the reactions of members of the Max Planck Society, including Rudolf's doctoral supervisor. The letter from the Central Council is reproduced in facsimile on p. 14. See also "In der Bundesacht," *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 51-57.
67. "In der Bundesacht" contains details of this and other events leading up to the trial of Rudolf. An almost fair account of his dismissal from the Max Planck Institute is in "Holocaust denial research disclaimed," by Alison Abbott, in *Nature*, Vol. 368 (April 7, 1994), p. 483. In the article the Max Planck Society (MPS) "is said to be extremely upset ... particularly ... about claims from right-wing groups that the society supported the report's findings and that Rudolf's dismissal was orchestrated by the Central Council for Jews in Germany — charges which the Society vigorously denies" (and so does Rudolf: see *Der Fall Rudolf*, p. 15). "Last week it [the MPS] issued a statement saying that it supports the German Supreme Court's ruling that mass murder of Jews is a historical fact that needs no further proof. A spokesman for the Society says that even if the samples sent to the Fresenius Institute are genuine, Rudolf's interpretation of the data is invalid because there are so many unknown factors involved, such as whether or not the chosen chamber was one of those known to have been rebuilt before the allied troops entered the camp, or whether residues in the delousing chambers could have remained because much higher concentrations of cyanide were used to kill lice". Rudolf responded to each of these points in an open letter to the MPS. See *Der Fall Rudolf*, pp. 15-19.
68. Verfahren gegen Germar Scheerer, LG Stuttgart 17 KLs 83/94. After his marriage Rudolf officially changed his name to Scheerer, his wife's maiden name. His defense attorney was Günther Herzogenrath-Amelung. Many details of the sequence of events leading up to the conviction of Rudolf, 'denunciation', 'prosecution', 'vilification by the media', 'destruction of the private domain', 'homelessness, 'special treatment' can be found in his article "In der Bundesacht" ("Federal Banning"), which first appeared in the Munich journal *Staatsbriefe*, No. 12/1995 (Verlag Castel del Monte, Postfach 14 06 28, 80456 München, Germany), pp. 10-15, and subsequently in the 1996 anthology *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 51-57. Apart from *Der Fall Rudolf*, other sources used for the present article include the *Prozessprotokoll*, or court records with the *Aktenzeichen* (file numbers), the *Anklageschrift* (indictment brief, *Staatsanwaltschaft Stuttgart*, 4 Js 34417/93), the Court's 240-page *Urteil* (judgment or verdict). The collection of documents, *Der Prozess: Verfahren gegen G. Scheerer*; LG Stuttgart; 17 KLs 83/94, was privately published by Rudolf and includes the *Urteil*, the defense's *Revisionsbegründung* (basis for a review of the trial and to have the sentence set aside), compiled by attorney Ludwig Bock, Rudolf's critical notes on the *Urteil*, as well as the *Urteilschelte*, which is an analysis of the *Urteil* as a whole. *Der Prozessverlauf*, the "report of an observer" at the trial, has also been consulted, as well as *Plädoyer der Staatsanwältin* (plea of the public prosecutor), *Plädoyer des Verteidigers* (plea of the defense attorney) as well as *Schlusswort des Angeklagten* (closing speech of the accused).
69. On p. 6 of the indictment these are listed as coming under the following sections of the Penal Code (*Strafgesetzbuch*) (1)(a) and (b): Incitement of the people (*Volksverhetzung*), §130, Nos. 1, 3; (2): Denigration of the Memory of the Dead *Verunglimpfung des Andenkens Verstorbener*, §189 and §194 par. 2.2; (3): §185 and §194 par. 1.2. "Inciting racial hatred" also fell under §131. Although Rudolf was tried under the less harsh "Lex Engelhard" law of 1985 — which did not yet make questioning of the Holocaust as such an offense — it is difficult to gainsay the impression that Rudolf's judges covertly applied the more repressive law passed in December 1994. On the development of these laws see A. Weusthoff's essay "Endlich geregelt? — Zur Ahndung der Holocaust-Leugnung durch die deutsche Justiz" by in the collection *Die Auschwitzleugner* (pp. 252-272), cited in note 43 above. See *Consiliarien* 1 cited in note 187 below for a revisionist angle.
70. Indictment, pp. 3, 4f, 9-14. On p. 14 note how the qualification "partial" has been dropped.
71. The first quote is from someone who claimed that an uncle was gassed at Dachau, the second is by Britain's chief rabbi I. Jakobovits on the Holocaust industry, and the third is by Michael Wolffsohn, a professor of history at Germany's *Bundeswehr* academy, who states that Auschwitz is "the one remaining foundation for Jewish identity."
72. In an e-mail communication to me of October 28, 2000, Rudolf wrote the following:

    "You might add this declaration of mine to any upcoming publication:

    "Even though I frequently stressed during my trial in

Germany in 1994/95 that I was not involved in the production and distribution of General Remer's politically commented version of my Expert Report about the gas chambers of Auschwitz, this is not entirely true. The truth is, that in early 1993 I was approached by an acquaintance of General Remer. This person asked me if I would be opposed if Remer, in an act of self-defense, would send copies of my Report to representatives of Germany's High Society. In 1992, Remer, though over 80 years old and having suffered two strokes, was sentenced to 22 months imprisonment for, inter alia 'Holocaust denial.' His judges did not allow him to present any evidence to prove his innocence. Every attempt by the defense lawyers to introduce such evidence, including my Expert Report, was rejected since German jurisdiction regards the Holocaust as 'self-evident.' Remer would most likely have died in prison. Therefore, he, his lawyers and associates considered this sentence to be a death penalty. Hence, they thought they had the right to go to extremes and publish my report in order to make Germany's High society aware of how a German court hands down a death penalty against someone — whom many people considered to be an old, severely ill WWII war hero — on account of his dissenting historical views. In 1997, three years after he fled Germany, Remer died in Exile. So he most likely would indeed have died in prison.

"Though I anticipated that Remer's intended action might cause problems for me, I nevertheless did not deny him his right to self-defense, and that is what I told his acquaintance. After all, why do we do revisionism in the first place? To hide it? To refuse to help people in distress? Did I prepare a legal expertise for the defense of people and then refuse to let them defend themselves with it?

"This 'nod' was all I ever contributed to Remer's distribution of my Report. I was not involved in the production nor distribution of his version, nor did I know anything about the preface (a justification for Remer's action) or the epilogue (a report of his own trial) which Remer and his associates had added to my Report. I actually learned about these additions only after Remer's distribution had started in April 1993, and I read them for the first time in my life during my trial in 1995. For theses additions, but not for my Report — which was considered to be formally scientific by the court itself, I was eventually sentenced to 14 months imprisonment.

"It was the obvious intention of the court not only to put me in prison for a 'thought crime' I did not commit, but to put all people in prison who were involved in Remer's desperate act of self-defense. It therefore agreed not to reveal the identity of any other persons involved in order to protect them. We succeeded in this. The court, on the other hand, conducted its proceedings in a vicious show trial manner, since this of course was the only way for them to either break me and make me reveal the real 'culprits' or to 'prove' an obviously innocent man guilty. A court, however, that does not try to seek truth, justice and fairness, but tries to destroy as many innocent citizens' lives as it can, did and does not deserve the truth.

"Germar Rudolf, Hastings, 27th October 2000."

It is not clear to me what Rudolf means by "formally scientific," but I understand the expression to mean that the outer form of his *Report* has all the trappings of a scientific paper. Compare the ruling of the *Bundesverfassungsgericht* (Federal Constitutional Court) on what it means to be scientific, as cited by Rudolf in his interesting essay "Über richtige und falsche Erkenntnisse," reprinted in *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 19 -47: For a text to enjoy protection of the basic law, "the only pre-requisite is that it concerns itself with science; here falls anything which according to content and form (*nach Inhalt und Form*) is to be regarded as a serious attempt to discover the truth" (p. 22). In Rudolf's case, in order to get around the "content" part, the court simply ignored it! See below, especially note 85.

See his deposition regarding the charges against him: *Stellungnahme zur Anklageschrift der Staatsanwaltschaft Stuttgart*, Az. 4 Js 34417/93, in the *Prozessprotokoll,* Section A, Paragraph 2. The official trial record (*Prozessprotokoll*) contains only a basic record of the trial proceedings, such as when a witness appeared, and that he/she made a statement to the subject (*zur Sache*), without recording anything of what was actually said. (On such procedures, see also notes 92 and 93 below). The *Prozessprotokoll* also includes written submissions by the defense and the accused.

73. Rudolf's statement of May 3, 1995, on why he used the pen name Ernst Gauss. For the book *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte* he did this in order not to endanger his doctorate, while he was persuaded by his publisher to use the same name for *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* because Remer had ruined his own name and he wished to spare the revisionist cause "further immeasurable harm." He chose this particular pen name because the research topic of his Ph.D. involved the work of one of the greatest mathematicians of all time: Carl Friedrich Gauss.
74. *Urteil* (judgment), pp. 171-172.
75. *Urteil*, pp. 11f, 137 and 228f. On p. 137 we read that the aim of publishing his *Report* in the Spring of 1993 was "to initiate the long sought-for discussion on 'revisionist' themes ..."
76. *Notwehraktion*: the word used by Remer in his pirated copy.
77. *Urteil*, p. 12.
78. How could the judges possibly think they knew this?
79. *Urteil*, pp. 12-13.
80. *Urteil*, pp. 235-240. The court turned down the defense's submission (*Hilfsbeweisantrag*) to have Rudolf's conclusions (A) and (B) tested by competent scientists, since "jurisdiction decided long ago that the mass-murder of the Jews, perpetrated in particular at Auschwitz, is a notorious (*offenkundig*) historical fact and needs no proof." (*Urteil*, pp. 231f).
81. The defense unsuccessfully objected to this procedure (*Selbstleseverfahren*). For the court's justification, see protocol exhibit 1 for November 25, 1994. The same procedure was ordered for the introductory chapter of *Grundlagen*. In this way the court avoided open reading of texts that might have favored the accused. (See

also *Der Prozeßverlauf*, p. 2). According to Rudolf, the court declared on the second day of the trial (November 23) that it was technically unqualified to judge his *Report*. See "Die Rolle der Presse im Fall Germar Rudolf," *Kardinalfragen* p.72.

82. *Urteil*, pp. 15, 23. The statement on p. 15, on how the revisionists aim to have a public debate on "difficult to explain details of National Socialist mass-crimes [*schwer aufklärbare Details der nationalsozialistische Massenverbrechen*]" clearly looks forward to the "chemical detail" mentioned on p. 23. How much like French National Front Leader Jean Marie Le Pen's claim that the wartime German 'gas chambers' are a "detail" of the Second World War! (*Liberation*, Sept. 15, 1987, p. 6). Nobody seems willing to forgive Le Pen for his silly remark, and he is seldom quoted in full. Thus the London *Sunday Times* of March 2, 1997 (p.19) writes that he referred "to the Holocaust as a 'detail in the history of the second world war'."
83. *Urteil*, pp. 23f. The awkward reasoning is the court's, not mine.
84. So for example in the indictment: *angeblich wissenschaftlich fundierter Untersuchung* (p. 3); *"Revisionismus"-Bewegung, pseudowissenschaftlichen Methoden*, *"Gutachten"* (twice), *"Rudolf-Gutachten,"* *"Leuchter-Report"* (p. 9); *seiner "Arbeit"*(p.13). Similarly, in the judgment (*Urteil)* one finds: *seine angeblich rein wissenschaftlichen Absichten* (p.12); *Scheinargument* (p.13); *sachlich erscheinen sollte, objektiv erscheinende Schriften*, "revisionistisches," *Anschein der Objektivität, Anspruch auf Wissenschaftlichkeit, sachliche erscheinende, ging es ihm ... darum, eine lebhafte Diskussion über den Inhalt des "Gutachtens" und andere "revisionistische" Thesen nach aussen hin vorzutäuschen* (pp.18f); *Anschein seiner Objektivität, "wissenschaftlichen" Schriften* (p. 20), *Eindruck einer unbefangenen ... Wissenschaftlichkeit* (p. 23), *Aus Gründen der scheinbaren Glaubwürdigkeit* (p. 24 — in a note on this Rudolf writes: "baseless impudent imputation"), *die Strategie der Sachlichkeit* (p. 24), *in objektivem Stil* (p. 25 — referring to a summary of the Rudolf's report in *DGG* of May, 1993), größtmöglicher *Anschein von Sachlichkeit* ("maximum possible show of objectivity," p. 26, referring to *Grundlagen*). Compare the closing speech of the Public Prosecutor: *Es bestand Interesse an einer Form, die den Anschein einer rein wissenschaftlicher Arbeit erweckt*, which Rudolf calls *unfundierte* (unfounded) *Spekulation* (n. 7 of his edition).
85. Cited in point 7 of Rudolf's deposition respecting the charges against him.
86. According to the *Prozeßverlauf*, p. 21, the court refused to accept into evidence the statements of 10 witnesses that the accused decisively distanced himself from National Socialist ideology. On January 9, 1995, defense witness Horst Lummert testified before the court. Deeply rooted in his Jewishness, he stated that he was especially sensitive to lies, with the result that he respected the revisionists' approach to the Holocaust issue more than that of their opponents. Having maintained a correspondence with the accused for about a year, he understood that Rudolf had reservations about going ahead with his revisionist research because he was concerned about the detrimental consequences it might have for Jews. Because he, Lummert, had encouraged the accused to proceed further with his revisionist activities, he felt that he, and not Rudolf, should be in the dock. In a June 30, 1994, letter to Rudolf, Lummert had written that Ignatz Bubis (head of the Central Council of German Jews) could well be called Germany's "Godfather," adding that "behind this so-called Russian Mafia lay hidden Chechnyans, Ukrainians, Russians and above all Jews... No one would dare to speak correctly of a 'Jewish Mafia'." Thus, Lummert went on, misuse of the Holocaust impeded the fight against organized crime. See *Der Prozessverlauf*, pp.10f. The full text of Lummert's letter is reproduced in n.6. Lummert has his own website, which posts articles on the Holocaust and revisionism at www.kokhavivpublications.com.
87. *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, "Streitpunkt Judenvernichtung: Eine Einleitung," pp. 15-39. Also, *Dissecting the Holocaust* (2000), pp. 13-14.
88. *Urteil*, p. 26f
89. *Urteil*, pp. 273f.
90. *Urteil*, p. 238ff. The quotation marks in 'more understandable' are in the original (*"verständlicher" machen*). The translation of *Überzeugungstäter* is taken from the South African *Citizen* of June 24, 1995, p. 18, which also cites the court's claim that Rudolf "selectively used evidence to provide a scientific cover to a gruesome lie that feeds neo-Nazi sentiment."
91. Although it appears in the charge sheet, at no time during the entire trial was the absurd claim raised that Rudolf identifies with National Socialist racial ideology. Nevertheless, it appears in the judgment, from where the press picked it up. See "Die Rolle der Presse im Fall Germar Rudolf" in *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 65-73 (p. 71 and footnote 34). Rudolf's study, "Webfehler im Rechtsstaat" (*Kardinalfragen*, pp. 59-63), fills a gap in our knowledge of the trial and how this flaw in the law affected his case.
92. It is worth quoting Ruth Bettina Birn (who is Chief Historian in the War Crimes Section of the Department of Justice, Canada): "Statements in the German legal system are not *verbatim* transcriptions, but a summary prepared by the interrogator; they are not the words of the person himself, and only in some cases are direct quotations inserted," in "Revising the Holocaust" from *A Nation on Trial: The Goldhagen Thesis and Historical Truth* by Norman G. Finkelstein and Ruth Bettina Birn (New York: An Owl Book: Henry Holt and Co., 1997), pp.106-107. Records, such as they are, are kept at the Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltung in Ludwigsberg,

and have been used (for example) by Christopher R. Browning for his *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York, 1992).

93. See "In der Bundesacht," *Kardinalfragen*, p. 53.
94. About the *VffG*, see "Important New German-Language Revisionist Quarterly," *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1998, pp. 26-27. Rudolf was the editor of *VffG* from its inception (private communication). Its first nominal editor had been Herbert Verbeke, who founded the *Stiftung Vrij Historisch Onderzoek* ("Foundation for Free Historical Research"), P.O. Box 60, B-2600 Berchem 2, Belgium. On the VHO foundation, with remarks on revisionism (including the "Auschwitz-Lüge") in Belgium, see "A Belgian Foundation Battles for Free Speech," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1996 (Vol.16, No.1), p. 46. Since the summer of 1998, Rudolf has used his own imprint: Castle Hill Publishers (PO Box 118, Hastings TN34 3ZQ, England — UK). For more on *VffG* and Castle Hill publishers, see the VHO website www.vho.org/chp.
95. Perhaps the most important of these works is the first thorough study of the Majdanek (Lublin) concentration camp, *KL Majdanek*: *Eine historische und technische Studie* by Jürgen Graf and Carlo Mattogno. For the entire program of Castle Hill books, whether available for free online or for purchase, see the VHO website. The writings of Leuchter, Faurisson and Rudolf are all to some extent criticized in this book. Rather than regarding this criticism as unkindness to fellow revisionists, it may well indicate that they now feel confident enough of the essential correctness of their central theses to criticize one another openly. For the controversy surrounding this publication, see "Eine Revisionistische Monographie über Majdanek" by R. Faurisson in *VffG*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1999), pp. 209-212; "Offener Brief an Prof. Robert Faurisson" by J. Graf in *VffG* , Vol. 3, No. 3 (1999), pp. 327-330; Faurisson's response, "Antwort an Jürgen Graf" in the same issue of *VffG*, pp. 330-332; and Carlo Mattogno's online reply (in Italian and English) at Granata's website.
96. Rudolf e-mail statement, October 18, 1999.
97. Rudolf e-mail statement, October 19, 1999.
98. For a list of works restricted or banned in Germany, see Germar Rudolf's website.
99. Proposals to introduce legislation making "Holocaust denial" a criminal offense in Britain date back at least to 1996. That year the *Electronic Telegraph* of October 4, reported under the heading "Delegates in tears over Dunblane's handgun plea" that "LEGISLATION to make it a criminal offence to deny the Holocaust was called for by delegates yesterday. They decided unanimously to make it a criminal offence to publish, broadcast, distribute or display material that denies six million Jews were killed by the Germans. Sharon McColl, of Paole Zion, the Jewish society affiliated to the Labour Party, told delegates that it was already an offence in many countries including Australia, France, Spain, Switzerland and Israel. 'Denial of the holocaust is a deliberate falsification of history for political purposes. This is deeply hurtful to survivors and victims of the Nazi regime', she said, adding that 'Making it a criminal offence is the only way to make sure this obscenity is removed.'" For further information see also "Labour plans jail for denial of Holocaust in the *Sunday Times* of September 29, 1996, p. 1.24. According to the two dissident former Labour MPs Christopher Mayhew and Michael Adams, Labour has had a formal affiliation with Paole Zion since 1920 (*Publish It Not*: *The Middle East Cover-Up* (Longmans, 1975), pp. 26, 33f, 38), an organization which "operates a racial test for membership" (p. 44, note). Labour seems to have temporarily abandoned the idea of legislating against Holocaust skeptics (The *Electronic Telegraph*, Friday, January 21, 2000).
100. *Electronic Telegraph*, Issue 1619, Oct. 31, 1999.
101. January 16, 2000.
102. *The Hastings and St. Leonards Observer*, March 31, 2000.
103. MP Dismore proposed "To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will make a statement concerning the case of Germar Rudolf." Response, May 22, 2000, by Home Secretary Mike O'Brien, http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk.
104. A letter by Paul Stocks protesting the prejudiced reporting of Hastings and Berry was published by the *Electronic Telegraph* of October 20, 1999, as was David Irving's in the *Sunday Telegraph* of October 24, 1999. Unfortunately, Irving, followed by Stocks, repeats the error that Rudolf's doctoral thesis was about "the permanence of cyanide compounds ...[and was] highly praised by his peers." My own attempts to draw the attention of *Sunday Telegraph* editor Dominic Lawson to the unreasonableness of condemning someone for his writings without having read any of it, and that anti-revisionist legislation would be "un-English" (Matthew Parrish in *The Times* of February 7, 1997) were apparently ignored. The *Electronic Telegraph* of July 29, 1999, published in all seriousness "Germans attacked for 'forgetting' Holocaust'," the 'attacker' being none other than Ignatz Bubis himself!
105. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*, was first published New York 1993, and in England the following year by Penguin Books. Reviews of Lipstadt's book appeared in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1993 and Sept.-Oct. 1995.
106. Royal Courts of Justice 1996-I-No. 113, Queen's Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice Strand, London, before Mr. Justice Gray, between David John Cawdell Irving, Claimant, and (1) Penguin Books Limited (2) Deborah E. Lipstadt, Defendants. The transcripts of the trial can be found on Irving's website http://www.fpp.co.uk/online.html, which also con-

tains thousands of references, including press reports on the trial. References to the transcripts will be made by day only, so that "day 1" refers to the proceedings of Tuesday, January 11, 2000. Due to the technology used for transcribing the stenographic notes of Harry Counsell & Company, the transcripts contain many misspellings of proper names. On the trial, see "Media Coverage of the Irving-Lipstadt Trial, *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 2000, pp. 40-53, and, "From the Trial Proceedings," in the same *Journal* issue, pp. 54-55.

107. Rampton was instructed by Davenport Lyons and Mishcon de Reya.
108. Chapter 9, "The Gas Chamber Controversy," p. 181.
109. *Denying the Holocaust*, chapter 9, p. 161.
110. In notes 18 and 17 to chapter 9 she refers to the London *Sunday Times* of June 12 and July 10, 1977. Likewise, her claim on p. 161 that "Scholars have described Irving as a 'Hitler partisan wearing blinkers' and have accused him of distorting evidence and manipulating documents to serve his own purposes" is ascribed in note 16 to Martin Broszat, *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (October 1977), pp. 742, 769, cited in *Patterns of Prejudice*, Nos. 3-4 (1978), p. 8.
111. Judgment to be Handed Down on Tuesday, 11th April 2000 at 10.30 a.m. in Court 36, Royal Courts of Justice. Henceforth cited as Judgment.
112. Judgment, §4.7.
113. For details, see Irving's website http://www.fpp.co.uk.
114. *Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present* (New York, 1996). In his expert report Van Pelt stated it was a "moral certainty" that Auschwitz was an extermination camp (pp. 8, 183). In the Morris film "Mr. Death," Van Pelt repeats this phrase, stating that the place was the "holy of holies," and that he regarded Leuchter's descent into Krema II to collect samples as unforgivable. He is described as an historian of architecture on the cover of *Auschwitz,* but during the libel trial he described himself as a "cultural historian" (day 9 of the proceedings, p. 38 of the transcript).
115. Professor Browning testified for the prosecution in the second, 1988 Zündel trial. See B. Kulaszka's *Did Six Million Really Die?*, pp. 84-157.
116. See Irving's opening speech on day 1 of the proceedings, particularly pp. 55-87. The text of Irving's Opening Statement in the trial is in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Sept.-Dec. 1999, pp. 16-35.
117. Judgment, §3.6.
118. Judgment, §3.8.
119. In an e-mail message sent out the day after the verdict Arthur Butz wrote: "As I recall I said ... to the extent that Irving claims that Lipstadt damaged his reputation in any measurable sense, he will lose. Irving was not blackballed by the publishing industry because of Lipstadt's book. There was not the element of what American lawyers call 'but for cause.' Most of the time the trial considered other issues whose involvement in a libel suit was hard to understand ... Irving's position was hopeless from the outset." Also published in *The Journal of Historical Review*, March-April 2000, p. 71.
120. Judgment §2.13.
121. Chapter 3, pp. 41-102.
122. Evans expert report, § 3.6.1
123. Served on September 5, 1996.
124. "I do not intend to go into the question of whether or not there were gas chambers at Birkenau" (Day 1, p. 29). Ernst Zündel, in his *Power* newsletter of January 11, 2000 (Issue No. 250), remarked on Irving's "wish to stay away from the Holocaust and make these trials strictly libel trials...," and predicts that "David is going to have a Holocaust trial whether he likes it or not."
125. As he himself emphasized throughout the trial. See, for example, the proceedings of day 1 (p.30): "I have never claimed to be a Holocaust historian ... If I have spoken about it, it is usually because somebody has asked me a question, I have been questioned about it. On such occasions I have emphasized my lack of expertise and I have expatiated only upon those areas with which I am familiar. In doing so I have offended many of my friends who wish that history was different, but you cannot wish documents away, and it is in documents that I have always specialized as a writer." He repeated this disclaimer on day 2 (pp. 234, 242); day 5 (p. 126); day 6 (pp. 41, 81) and day 8 (p. 183). That he only talks about the Holocaust when someone asks a question is plainly untrue, as can be seen from his talk "Battleship Auschwitz," given at the Tenth (1990) IHR Conference, and published in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1990-91 (Vol. 10, No. 4), pp. 491-508.
126. On day 14 of the proceedings (p. 131) Rampton put it to Irving that at his October 10, 1995, speech at Tampa, Florida, he had said "I find the Holocaust endlessly boring." Irving said much the same thing in his speech at the IHR meeting in Orange County, California, on March 28, 1998.
127. Irving's closing speech on day 32 (p. 49): "This trial is about my reputation as a human being, as an historian of integrity ...". On this see also pp. 59, 61, 66, 135 of the same day as well as pp. 132, 141 of day 2.
128. Day 1 of the proceedings, p. 2. Another aspect of the "strangeness" of the trial was Justice Gray's avowal that it was not for him to judge the facts of history, yet in his Judgment that is precisely what he did when he found Lipstadt's "experts" to be more credible than Irving. On this and other interesting aspects of the trial, see Mark Weber's article "After the Irving-Lipstadt trial: New Dangers and Challenges," in the March-April 2000 *Journal of Historical Review* (Vol. 19, No. 12), pp. 2-8.
129. Day 8, p. 120f.
130. Faurisson dated his piece, "David Irving en ce moment," January 19, 2000. Both the English and French versions have been posted on Irving's site: "What Revisionists Say about The Irving Trial" also includes the views of Bradley Smith, Ernst Zündel,

Robert Faurisson, Serge Thion, Ingrid A. Rimland, Germar Rudolf, A. S. Marques and Michael A. Hoffman II.

131. Focus on History No. 1: *Auschwitz: The End Of the Line: The Leuchter Report. The First Forensic Examination of Auschwitz* (London: Focal Point Publications, June 1989). It is also on Irving's website.
132. For most people it would not make sense to take "this myth" in Irving's introduction as referring only to Auschwitz. In the 1991 Focal Point edition of *Hitler's War* we read: "By late 1945 the world's newspaper's were full of unsubstantiated lurid rumours about 'factories of death' complete with lethal 'gas chambers'" (p. 466). Compare Irving's letter of May 21, 1989, to Rainer Zitelmann: "It is clear to me that no serious historian can now believe that Auschwitz, Treblinka, Majdanek were Todesfabriken [death factories]. All the expert and scientific (forensic) evidence is to the contrary," as quoted by Justice Gray in Judgment, §8.16.
133. David Irving, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers" (presented at the Eleventh IHR Conference, October 1992), *The Journal of Historical Review* March-April 1993 (Vol. 13, No. 2), pp. 14-25 (p. 22).
134. Made at the Latvian Hall, Toronto, November 8, 1990, cited by Rampton on p. 25 of day 20 of the proceedings.
135. For example, on day 29. Rampton: "You frequently refer to the non-existence of any gas chambers in the plural." Irving: "I think you will have to show me the passages where I frequently say this." Justice Gray: "The point is you deny the existence of gas chambers and, when you do that, you do not talk only of the dummies such as the one that was constructed after the war at Auschwitz. That I think is the point." In his closing speech Irving corrected his error when he spoke of "the one shown to tourists" (day 32, p. 189).
136. *Hitler's War* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1977; and, New York: Viking, 1977). Irving's thesis prompted the response by Gerald Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution* (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif., 1984). In Germany Irving's thesis contributed to the *Historikerstreit* or "historians' dispute," involving most of the country's leading historians, including Martin Broszat, who became head of the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* (Institute for Contemporary History) in Munich and who disagreed strongly with Irving's thesis. (On this see also the interview with Ernst Nolte in the Jan.-Feb. 1994 *Journal of Historical Review.*)
137. Among the contributions to "What Revisionists Say about The Irving Trial" is Germar Rudolf's remarks "Those who choose to be their own lawyer choose a fool." We also read there that "David Irving refused to present Germar Rudolf as an expert witness." Irving himself claims the opposite, as can be seen on his index to items on the libel case: "Max-Planck Institute scientist Germar Rudolf (who turned down Mr Irving's request to attend court as a special adviser, for security reasons) ..." This claim is rather hollow given that any expert witness had to be presented a year earlier, and an expert report had to be handed in many months before the trial actually started, neither of which was done. Rudolf informs me that early in 1999 Irving asked him if he would be willing to appear as an expert witness, and that although Rudolf agreed, he "never heard from him again." Given that this "request" was made long before the anti-Rudolf press campaign, there can be little justification for Irving's claim that he did not want to jeopardize Rudolf's security. On the same occasion Rudolf tried hard to convince Irving that the very brief summary of Rudolf's report was falsely claimed to be the report itself, but to no avail. Later that year Irving sent Rudolf a copy of van Pelt's submission, asking him to comment. Rudolf again asked if he was to appear as an expert witness and again received no reply. Only a week before van Pelt took the stand did Irving finally admit that it was far too late to use Rudolf's expertise. It seems clear that Irving never had any intention of doing this anyway. His comment to Rudolf on *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* says it all: "I don't read the books of others." Rudolf tells me that on other occasions Irving was more frank, declaring that he "didn't want to associate with a convicted criminal and neo-Nazi ... didn't want to get into the Auschwitz-affair in the first place..."
138. "Critique of Chemical Claims Made by Robert Jan van Pelt," is on Rudolf's website. Version 1 is dated January 2000 and version 2, January-February 2000.
139. http://www.vho.org/GB/Contributions/Critique-Gray.html
140. In "Critique of Chemical Claims Made by Robert Jan van Pelt," Rudolf has added a number of references not in his previous works. In section 6(b) he writes: "The cement plaster used in the morgues has a much higher tendency to accumulate HCN than the lime plaster used in the delousing facilities, and this tendency prevails longer as cement mortar and plaster stays alkaline for many months and years, whereas lime mortar become neutral relatively quickly (in weeks rather than months, depending on temperature, humidity, amount of CO2 available and on the consistency of the mortar," with a reference to the discussion about his report at http://www.vho.org.
141. For example, on day 8, p. 56: "Gelmar [Germar] Rudolf did a much more detailed scientific test," also on day 8, pp.76f, day 9, p. 13, day 18, pp. 94f, day 20, p. 17.
142. Consider the tragicomical scene on Day 8 (p. 187): Mr Rampton: "I have never seen the Rudolf Report because it is not in Mr. Irving['s] discovery". Irving: "Yes, it is." Rampton: "I am told it is not." Irving: "If it is not then I humbly apologise. It certainly should have been, and I will provide copies immediately." Mr. Justice Gray: "Professor van Pelt needs time particularly because he will be the one who has to deal with it. How easy would it be for you to dig it out?" Irving: "I can have it couriered around this afternoon." Mr.

Justice Gray: "That would be helpful ..." That Rudolf's report never made an appearance at the trial is clear from Justice Gray's statement: "... I do not consider that an objective historian would have regarded the Leuchter report as a sufficient reason for dismissing, or even doubting, the convergence of evidence on which the Defendants rely for the presence of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. I have not overlooked the fact that Irving claimed that Leuchter's findings have been replicated, notably in a report by Germar Rudolf. But that report was not produced at the trial so it is impossible for me to assess its evidential value."(Judgment, §13.80).

143. Day 9, p. 14.

144. Day 9, pp. 21-35. The first report was made in 1945. Cyanide traces were found in some women's hair and metal objects found in Krema II but the results are only qualitative, not quantitative. This was touted at the trial as the first proof of homicidal gassings. See Rudolf's report, §6.1 for a brief critique.

145. Why did Rampton show Van Pelt what was clearly the summary version of Rudolf's report and point out that the 120-page *Rudolf Report* was advertised on the inside cover? Is it possible that Irving had brought this flimsy brochure into court? (P. 23). Indeed it is, because he rarely reads the works of others, and probably had not even read this "summary."

146. Day 9, pp. 23-26.

147. "I have been very impressed in general by the professionalism of the historians at Auschwitz" declared Van Pelt on day 9 (p. 66).

148. Especially chapter 6 of Rudolf's report (if only §6.6 on the 1990 Cracow report), as well as the articles cited above, "Leuchter-Gegengutachten: ein wissenschaftlicher Betrug?," and Rudolf's correspondence with the Jan Sehn Institute *(Kardinalfragen*, pp. 81-90). Expressly in connection with Irving's trial, Rudolf has placed his comments on the Cracow reports, "A Fraudulent attempt to refute 'Mr. Death'," on the Internet at vho.org/GB/contributions/, which will also shortly appear in *The Revisionist*.

149. In an interview shown in Errol Morris' film "Mr. Death". See day 8 of the proceedings, p. 59. See Greg Raven's review of "Mr. Death," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Sept.Dec. 1999, pp. 62-69.

150. Not only from what Rudolf wrote, but just a little common sense tells one that Prussian Blue should not be "problematic." This was pointed out in my March 28, 1998, talk when Irving was in the audience, and later at a dinner organized by Mark Weber. Before the London libel trial Germar Rudolf pleaded with Irving not to bring this up, and also not to claim that his doctoral work dealt with cyanide compounds — all to no avail. Instead, on numerous occasions during the trial Irving explicitly cited the Cracow Institute as a confirmation of Leuchter — for example on day 8 (pp. 44, 62f, 76, 186), on day 9 (p. 13), and in his closing address (day 32, pp. 151, 155), which is also in the March-April 2000 IHR *Journal*, p. 37. It is likewise disappointing that the *IHR Update* newsletter of May 2000 would still site the Cracow Institute as failing "to substantiate evidence of mass murder."

151. To borrow Rampton's expression (day 8, p. 178).

152. Day 8, pp. 41-82. On day 7 Irving's press conference of 23rd June 1989 launching the Focal Point edition of Leuchter's report was raised. Irving had stated "... hydrogen cyanide is wonderful for killing lice, but not so good for killing people unless in colossal concentrations". In agreement with Rampton, he had not taken "any steps to verify the scientific and biological correctness of that statement". The lawyer was in fact correct to say that "it is complete rubbish." The whole issue is discussed in detail by Rudolf. See chapter 4, especially §4.4 of his report, or *Vorlesungen zur Zeitgeschichte*, chapter 3, especially §3.3 where "Gauss" expresses "no doubt" that higher concentrations are needed for killing insects than for killing humans. My own feeling is that this issue will become central when, one day, Rudolf's work is discussed rationally.

153. Day 8, pp. 54f. See also p. 82.

154. Day 8, pp. 39, 69. Rampton, referring to Leuchter's statement on "exposed porous brick and mortar" [which would allow HCN to penetrate into the wall] said "It is just logical rubbish, is it not?" and Irving conceded: "It does strike me as being unscientific, that particular sentence, yes" (p.112).

155. Judgment, §13.83. Days 10 and 11 were spent arguing photographic evidence. If the "gas chamber" had been used for fumigating (as Irving at one stage contended), then Justice Gray thought "it would seem that ducts or some other form of aperture would have been required to introduce the pellets into the chamber, since the morgue had no windows and a single gas-tight door." (§13.82). Since this is not the standard way to fumigate, this is plain nonsense.

156. Day 8, pp. 59-62. ("Germar" is misspelled "Gelman" in the transcript.)

157. Day 10, p. 113.

158. Day 9, pp. 29-33.

159. Day 8, p. 56.

160. Day 29, p. 32.

161. Day 23, pp. 15f.

162. Day 5, pp. 125f. Irving: "You asked if it was true that large numbers of people and you said hundreds of thousands" — Rampton: "I said hundreds of thousands." Irving: — "were killed at these places to which I agreed that they were killed at those places, which included Treblinka, but this does not mean to say that Treblinka was a factory of death existing solely for that purpose." (p. 133).

163. Critical studies of the writings of Kurt Gerstein, the main "eyewitness" of gassing at Belzec, are Henri Roques' *The "Confessions" of Kurt Gerstein*, (Published in English by the IHR, 1989), and Carlo Mattogno's *Il Rapporto Gerstein: Anatomia di un Falso*, reviewed by R.A. Hall in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1986 (Vol. 7, No. 1), pp. 115-119. For the consequences suffered by Roques for writing a

doctoral dissertation about Gerstein, see "From the Gerstein Affair to the Roques Affair" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1988 (Vol. 8, No. 1), pp. 5-23, and "How Fairs the Roques Thesis?" in the Fall 1990 *Journal* (Vol. 10, No. 3), pp.371f.

164. Day 17, p. 154.

165. Day 6, pp. 38, 51.

166. This is the odd five-page RSHA note of June 5, 1942, signed by W. Just — held in Bundesarchiv as "Koblenz Document" R 58/ 871. Ingrid Weckert provides an analysis of this issue in "Die Gaswagen — Kritische Würdigung der Beweislage," in *Grundlagen*, pp. 193-218, and "The Gas Vans: A Critical Assessment of the Evidence," in *Dissecting the Holocaust*, pp. 217-243. An extensive revisionist study of the "gas vans," which includes a study of mechanical aspects of the issue, is Pierre Marais' 325-page study *Les camions à gaz en question* (Paris: Polémiques, 1994). Irving is obviously unfamiliar with these works.

167. Day 6, pp. 49f. These are Rampton's words, answered by Irving's "No question at all ... Again, there is no reference to Hitler, I am afraid." On a later day the topic was again raised, and Irving noted "I am not interested in that aspect of the history, no. I am interested in Adolf Hitler's personal role in decisions taken during World War II." (Day 14, pp. 68-70). Another example of Irving's rearguard actions is when he subsequently pointed out that the document in question has numerous linguistic anomalies.

168. Day 32, pp. 20f.

169. On October 23, 1997, a criminal court in Paris fined Robert Faurisson more than $20,000 because he considered "the Nazi gas chamber as an" 'imposture'." See I. Rimland's Z-Gram of October 31, 1997, as well as Faurisson's articles, "Revisionism on Trial: Developments in France, 1979-1983," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1985 (Vol. 6, No. 2), pp. 133-181, and "My Life as a Revisionist (September 1983 to September 1987)" in the Spring 1989 *Journal* (Vol. 9, No. 1), pp. 5-63. *Histoire du négationnisme en France* by Valérie Igounet (Éditions du Seuil, March 2000), a work of 691 pages, purports to be a history of revisionism in France.

170. Since April 1995 the book *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* has been banned in Germany. For a brief report of its banning, see "Revisionist Books Seized in German Police Raid" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1995 (Vol. 15, No. 3), p. 43. According to circulars dated July 1, 1996, and issued by S. Verbeke and Germar Rudolf, Judge Burkhardt Stein of the Tübingen District Court (*Amtsgericht*) decided that Rudolf had to be arrested because of *Grundlagen*. The judge also ordered the confiscation of all remaining copies of the book, which meant that they would quite literally land up in the fire. The publisher, Wigbert Grabert, was ordered to pay a fine of DM 30,000. See *Kardinalfragen*, pp. 49f: "Deutsches Gerichtsurteil: Wissenschaftliches Werk wird verbrannt!". In the article "Über richtige und falsche Erkenntnisse" (*Kardinalfragen*, pp.19-47), Rudolf gives a list of works that suffered a similar fate between 1993 and 1995. In the scandalous case of Günter Deckert, who had to be tried and re-tried until he was found guilty, judges who had 'only' imposed a fine and a suspended sentence were severely criticized and forced into early retirement. See "Political Leader Punished," *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1993 (Vol. 13, No. 4), p. 26, and "Two-Year Prison Sentence for 'Holocaust Denial'" by Mark Weber in the May-June 1995 *Journal* (Vol. 15, No. 3), pp. 40-42, where further sources can be found. See also "How-To for Neo-Nazis" in *Time*, August 22, 1994, p. 44, and *Der Spiegel* 47/ 1994, p. 35, and 11/1995, pp. 36f, in which the question of whether charges should be brought against the judges is considered. The Deckert case was also covered by the South African press: "Judge who sparked row is reinstated," the *Citizen*, September 20, 1994 (p. 12); "Anti-Semite: 'Court was too lenient'," the *Citizen,* December 16, 1994 (p. 14); "Judge who was soft on 'Nazi' retires," the *Citizen*, May 11, 1995 (p. 20); "Ruling gives right to forget," the *Sunday Times*, March 20, 1994 (p. 17). For a more complete study of the Deckert case see Günther Anntohn, Henri Roques, *Der Fall Günter Deckert* (DAGD/Germania Verlag, Weinheim 1995), a work banned in Germany (*Kardinalfragen*, p. 45). Members of the IHR *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee have been prosecuted and sentenced to prison. In Germany, Udo Walendy was sentenced to 15 months imprisonment without parole on account of his series *Historische Tatsachen*. (See the July-August 1998 *Journal of Historical Review*, pp. 14-16.) In Switzerland Jürgen Graf and his publisher Gerhard Förster were sentenced to prison terms for writing or publishing allegedly anti-Jewish books that "deny the existence of Nazi gas chambers." See "Swiss Court Punishes Two Revisionists," and associated articles, in *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1998, pp. 2-13. (By late 2000 Graf should already be serving his sentence.) In July 1998 Auschwitz State Museum authorities banned a British Broadcasting Company (BBC) television team and David Irving from visiting the former camp site. The BBC had invited Irving to be interviewed there. Irving was also barred from using the Museum's archives. See "Polish authorities Ban BBC Team and David Irving from Auschwitz," July-August 1998 *Journal of Historical Review*, pp. 16-17. The French organisation *aaargh* reports regularly on the persecution of revisionists in Europe. For example, the legal steps taken against the editors of *Sleipnir*: see "Nachrichten vom Tiergarten: aus der Bundeslächerlich Deutschland," a press release issued by the journal's editor in chief, Andreas Röhler (Verlag der Freunde, Postfach 350264, 10211 Berlin, Germany). *Sleipnir* regularly sends out e-mail reports and commentaries.

171. On the "moral foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany" see *Die Zeit*, December 12, 1993, cited in *Kardinalfragen*, p. 18, n. 8. "In der Bundesacht" relates how Rudolf had been a member of the Bonn branch of the Catholic Students' Union AV Tuisconia Königsberg since 1983, but when in the Spring of 1994 his revisionist activities became known he was excluded from this Union. This was primarily justified as follows: "The Holocaust and its avowal forms the normative basis of our constitution. The legitimacy — in the sense of worthiness of recognition (*Anerkennungswürdigkeit*) — of the constitution presupposes acknowledgement of National Socialist crimes to which the Jews fell victim in a massive way, having been destroyed by technical means. As Brother (Bundesbruder) Rudolf places the Holocaust, conceived of as planned mass murder, in doubt, he also casts doubt on the normative consensus which forms the basis of our constitution." To protest the introduction of the sharpened 1994 form of laws criminalizing "Holocaust denial" I wrote to all members of the Bundesrat. One answer informed me that questioning the Holocaust amounted to insulting the memory of the dead, and since the respect for human dignity (*Menschenwürde*) is the very basis of the Federal Constitution, its enforcement has to take priority over freedom of expression. Annual reports on the "protection of the constitution" are published in the official *Verfassungsschutzbericht* edited by the Bundesministerium des Innern (Grauheindorfer Straße 198, 53117 Bonn) and give a good idea of the types of activity regarded as threatening to the constitution. Thus the 1993 issue, apart from chronicling the activities of genuine political radicals of both the right and the left, refers to "Holocaust denial" under *Neonazismus* and describes it as "anti-Semitic agitation." On p. 115 a partial reproduction of the front page of the July 1993 issue of *Remer Depesche* mentioning Rudolf is shown. In his *Action Report* of July 1998 (Online fpp.co.uk/) David Irving reproduced a newsletter from the Washington Embassy's "German Information Center ... justifying Bonn's human rights abuses"

172. For a detailed study of the history and scandals surrounding the "protection of the constitution" in Germany, see Claus Nordbruch's study, *Der Verfassungsschutz* (Tübingen: Hohenrain, 1999). Claus Nordbruch has also written a critical, thoroughly researched study of the suppression of free speech in Germany, with special emphasis on the 20th century: *Sind Gedanken noch frei? Zensur in Deutschland* (Universitas, 1998). His interesting article, "Political Correctness in Germany," which first appeared in the Swiss daily *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, June 12, 1999, is published in translation in the July-August 1999 *Journal of Historical Review* (Vol. 18, No. 4), pp. 36-38.

173. One recalls Faurisson's famous statement on the "historical lie" whose "principal victims ... are the German people — but not their leaders — ..." See "Revisionism on Trial: Developments in France, 1979-1983" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1985 (Vol. 6, No. 2), p. 162. Ziel's statement is in *Der Spiegel*, 35/1994, p. 38, col. 3.

174. On day 12 of the proceedings of the Irving-Lipstadt trial the American psychologist Professor Kevin McDonald appeared as an expert witness for Irving. On his testimony, see "An American Professor Responds to a 'Jewish Activist'," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 2000, pp. 54 ff. MacDonald propounds a theory of Judaism based on a Darwinian viewpoint: How Jews as a group have developed various strategies for survival. For information on this see the review "What Causes Anti-Semitism?" by P. Harrison in the May-June 1998 *Journal of Historical Review* (Vol. 17, No. 3), pp. 28-37. Irving posed his question to an audience at Washington State University, Pullman, on April 13, 1998.

175. *Le Monde*, December 29, 1978, and January 16, 1979. Translations of these letters are in "Faurisson's Three Letters to *Le Monde* (1978-179)," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 2000, pp. 40-46. The two books were published by La Vieille Taupe. A four-volume collection of Faurisson's revisionist writings over the years was published privately in 1999, *Écrits révisionnistes (1974-1998)*.

176. German President Roman Herzog as quoted by *Deutsche Welle* radio Sept. 9, 1996, at 7.30 GMT. Consider what Frank Füredi, author of *Mythical Past, Elusive Future: History and Society in an Anxious Age* (Pluto Press, 1992) writes on p. 42: "Whether or not this is stated, the discussion is always about how to come to terms with the experience of the Holocaust which remains a major obstacle to the reworking of a German identity. It is obvious that a past that includes such barbarism cannot be readily recruited to legitimize the present order. Various factors, more international than domestic, make it impossible to pretend that the Holocaust was a minor event or that it never happened."

177. See "Debating the Undebatable: The Weber-Shermer Clash," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1996 (Vol. 16, No. 1), pp. 23-34.

178. *Die Auschwitzleugner* (Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1996) cites many "deniers" who are quite clearly motivated by political or ideological considerations. Logically, disagreement with someone's politics should not automatically entail rejection of his/her arguments, but human behavior is not always governed by logic. Ernst Zündel may well ask himself if it was wise to boast that the *Leuchter Report* was introduced in court on Hitler's birthday (as can be seen in Morris's "Mr. Death").

179. See, for example, "Olocausto atto secondo" ("Holocaust, Act 2"), a "response" to Carlo Mattogno, published in the Italian magazine *L'Espresso* of March 27, 1990, and reproduced in Mattogno's *La soluzione finale: problemi e polemiche* ("The Final Solution:

Problems and Controversies"), Edizioni di Ar, 1991.

180. Translated from a private letter of Rudolf, written on October 23, 1991, at about the time when the first drafts of the *Rudolf Report* ("Das Blau Buch") were being completed. This information was cited on June 13, 1995 by Rudolf's attorney Günther Herzogenrath-Amelung during his final plea before the Stuttgart court trying Rudolf: See *Plädoyer des Verteidigers*, p. 10.

181. David Irving's concessions during his trial will no doubt provide a new stimulus to study these "Reinhardt" camps and also the "gas vans". His *Action Report* 2000 online reported a most interesting use of special radar to investigate the alleged mass graves at Treblinka. In the article an image is shown and Irving asks of it: "What is this interesting pattern below? A psychedelic painting? The Lord Chancellor's latest wallpaper? No, it is a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) scan of the alleged mass grave site at Treblinka, Poland, conducted to a depth of eighteen feet by an expert in November 1999: it seems the ground has remained undisturbed for millions of years. Clever old Nazis, to have put every stone back in place where it was — and in the panic of defeat." Although during the trial he hinted at GPR in his cross-examination of Van Pelt on day 9 (p. 82), he never took it further, let alone call as an expert witness the (unnamed) person who conducted the search,who is Richard Krege. See "'Vernichtungslager' Treblinka: archaelogisch betrachtet" in *VffG*, June 2000 (4. Jg. Heft 1, pp. 62-64), cited in "Treblinka Ground Radar Finds No Trace of Mass Graves," in the May-June 2000 *Journal of Historical Review*, p. 20. The only full-length IHR *Journal* article about the camp is "Treblinka," by M. Weber and A. Allen, in the Summer 1992 issue (Vol. 12, No. 2), pp. 133-158. The one scientific study of the "diesel gas chambers" allegedly used in this and other camps set up "purely for killing" is F.P. Berg's pioneering (and yet to be refuted) article "The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within a Myth" in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984 (Vol. 5, No. 1), pp. 15-46. According to the standard version, about half of all Holocaust deaths were by means of Diesel exhaust, nearly a million at Treblinka alone. An adaptation of Berg's article appears, under the title "Die Diesel-Gaskammern: Mythos im Mythos," in *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 321-345, and under the title "The Diesel Gas Chambers" in *Dissecting the Holocaust* (2000), pp. 435-465. See also the contribution by Arnulf Neumaier, "The Treblinka Holocaust," in *Dissecting the Holocaust* . Udo Walendy's interesting critical analysis of the photographic evidence concerning Treblinka is in *Historische Tatsachen,* No. 44. In 1989 Samuel Willenberg's *Surviving Treblinka* (Basil Blackwell) appeared in English. Willenberg describes meetings with Jankiel Wiernik, from whom he learned about the "gas chambers" in the so-called Upper ("Death") Camp of Treblinka II (pp. 125-126). By his own account it is clear that Willenberg had no direct knowledge of the Upper Camp. He appears as a guest in "The Road to Treblinka," the fifth episode of the 1997 BBC series "The Nazis — A Warning from History." The producers hide from us that Willenberg was never in the "Death camp," but with the full confidence of one who was on the spot, Willenberg relates details which he never witnessed. For example, that the Germans shouted "Schnell, Schnell" as the victims "were pushed into the gas chambers by the Ukrainians ... Here where I'm standing now within this small area 200 X 300 metres here lie buried about 850 000 bodies. Here they buried in enormous ditches which they dug out by a digger. Here they dumped the corpses of those who had been gassed." (Transcribed from the English subtitles). This is pure deception.

182. The *Ordnungspolizei* (security police battalions) are the subject of Christopher Browning's *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York, 1992). British historian and official Churchill biographer Martin Gilbert concentrates much of his *The Holocaust* (Fontana Paperbacks, 1987) on shootings. Most historians, including David Irving, accept that large numbers of Jews were murdered by such methods and bur.ed "sardine-like" in pits. In the *Hardtalk* interview conducted by Tim Sebastian and broadcast by BBC World on April 27, 2000, Irving stated unequivocally that "millions" were killed in this way. Was this (also) a tactical maneuver? And what is one to make of his statement made at the Pullman meeting on April 13, 1998: "Daniel Goldhagen has written a very good book [*Hitler's Willing Executioners*] on the Holocaust"? Referring to the IHR during his libel action, Irving boasted: "At their conferences I regularly rubbed their noses in what actually happened in the Holocaust." (Day 20, p.167. See also day 1, pp. 45-46, day 6, pp. 66-69, and day 28, pp. 91-96). It has been pointed out that the *Einsatzgruppen* reports on the numbers killed may be exaggerated, but by how much is a legitimate question. See Mark Weber's article "My Role in the Zündel Trial," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1989-1990 (Vol. 9, No. 4), pp. 389-425: "Although the *Einsatzgruppen* reports would indicate that 2.2 million Jews were killed, every reputable historian who has written on this subject acknowledges that this figure bears little relationship to reality" (p. 402). Strong reservations concerning the trustworthiness of the *Einzatzgruppen* reports have been expressed by Hans-Heinrich Wilhelm, regarded as one of the outstanding authorities on the subject, co-author with Helmut Krausnick of the detailed work *Die Truppe des Weltanschauungskrieges: Die Einsatzgruppen der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD* (Stuttgart, 1981). See his interesting essay, "Offene Fragen der Holocaust Forschung," pp. 403-425, in the collection *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit: Impulse zur Historisierung*

des Nationalsozialismus edited by U. Backes, E. Jesse and R. Zitelmann (Frankfurt/M + Berlin: 1992). Wilhelm's essay is based on a lecture with the same title he gave to the International History Conference held at the University of Riga, Latvia, Sept. 20-22, 1988. Here is the relevant passage from p. 11 of this lecture (which however does not appear in this form in *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit*): "Wenn auf nicht-statistischem Gebiet die Verlässlichkeit nicht grösser ist, was sich nur durch einen Vergleich mit anderen Quellen aus der gleichen Region erhärten liesse, wäre die historische Forschung gut beraten, wenn sie künftig von allen SS-Quellen viel misstrauischer Gebrauch machte als bisher." ("If, in the non-statistical sphere, the reliability [of these reports] is not greater, something which could only be confirmed by a comparison with other sources from the same region, researchers would be well-advised to make far more distrustful use of all SS sources in future than they have hitherto made.") I owe this source to R. Countess, who allowed me to make a copy of Wilhelm's Riga lecture. The essay by Margers Vestermanis, "Der lettische Anteil an der 'Endlösung'," in *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit* (pp. 426-449), examines the part played by Latvians in wartime executions of Jews. Although far from settling the issue, one source cited by Vestermanis attributes half the executions in the rural areas to a single Latvian commando unit (p. 436). On reprisals in the face of guerrilla actions, see the articles in *VffG,* June 1999, "Repressalie und Höherer Befehl," by K. Sigert (pp. 131-144), and "Partisanenkrieg und Repressaltötungen," by G. Rudolf and S. Schröder (pp. 145-153).

183. According to a top secret order of July 2, 1941, by security chief Reinhard Heydrich, the *Einsatzgruppen* were instructed "to execute" (*zu exekutieren*) Communist functionaries, "Jews in party and state positions" (*Juden in Partei-und Staatsstellungen*), and "other radical elements (saboteurs, propagandists, snipers, assassins, agitators, etc." They were also instructed to "promote" (*fördern*) pogroms, euphemistically dubbed "self-cleansing attempts" (*Selbstreinigungsversuchen*), by local anti-Jewish elements but "without trace" (*spurenlos*) of German involvement." This document is clearly relevant regarding the participation of local militias in massacres of Jews. This document was cited by Prof. Browning in §4.2 ("Escalation") of his expert report for the Irving-Lipstadt case. It was published some years earlier in P. Longerich, ed., *Die Ermordung der europäischen Juden* (Piper, 1990), pp. 116-118, and in Y. Arad, et al., *Documents on the Holocaust* (Yad Vashem, 1981), pp. 377-378.
184. Years ago Robert Faurisson suggested that a principal source for solving the problem of the numbers of "Holocaust" victims would be the records archive of the International Tracing Service (ITS) in Arolsen, Germany, which has been "closed to Revisionists since 1978." See "My Life as a Revisionist," *The Journal of Historical Review,* Spring 1989 (Vol. 9, No. 1), pp. 5-63, here p. 52. See also R. Faurisson, "Impact and Future of Holocaust Revisionism," in the Jan.-Feb. 2000 *Journal*, p. 8. That the ITS withholds information was recently confirmed in "Die Zeitzeugen sterben," *Der Spiegel,* 4/2000, pp. 60, 63. Ingrid Rimland's e-mail message of Feb. 21, 2000, dealt with this *Spiegel* article, but I found no mention there of the "criminals" she cited. The major revisionist work in the demographic area remains Walter N. Sanning's *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* (third IHR printing, Nov. 1990). This demographic study uses almost exclusively Jewish and Soviet sources. Germar Rudolf has made a comparative study of this in the "Holocaust Victims: A Statistical Analysis — W. Benz and W.N. Sanning: A Comparison," *Dissecting the Holocaust* (2000), pp. 183-216. This essay first appeared in *Grundlagen*, pp. 141-168.
185. Arthur Butz was the first person to perceive this clearly: "Although six extermination camps are claimed, one of them, Auschwitz, is the key to the whole story," *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (IHR, 10th US printing, 1997), p. 35. Faurisson has quoted Wilhelm Stäglich: "the extermination thesis stands or falls with the allegation that Auschwitz was a 'death factory'," (*The Leuchter Report*, p. 4).
186. For more than 20 years Robert Faurisson has called for an open and public debate on the "gas chambers" and "Holocaust" issues. See, for example, "Faurisson's Three Letters to *Le Monde* (1978-1979)," *The Journal of Historical Review,* May-June 2000, pp. 40-46. The videotaped exchange between Mark Weber and Michael Shermer on July 22, 1995, comes as close as can be expected to such a free debate. (See "Debating the Undebatable: The Weber—Shermer Clash," *The Journal of Historical Review* , Jan.-Feb. 1996, pp. 23-34.) Georg Batz of the Free Democratic Party (FDP) also organized such a debate, which took place in Nuremberg on September 20-22, 1991, under the auspices of the liberal and FDP-affiliated Thomas Dehler Foundation. (See "Liberal German Political Foundation Sponsors Open Debate on Holocaust Issue," *IHR Newsletter*, July-August 1992, pp. 7-8.) Batz invited Swiss educator Arthur Vogt to present the revisionist side at the seminar, which he described as "The Holocaust as Seen by the Revisionists: a Swiss Analyzes Contemporary History." The upshot of it all was that Vogt was later arrested for having stressed the importance of Leuchter's findings, while Batz was let off scott-free! Germar Rudolf attended this seminar, and it was here that his troubles began. A certain Dr. Körber swore at Rudolf and his companion there, calling them swine because they had dared give precedence to material evidence over that of eyewitnesses. Körber subsequently denounced Rudolf to the German police. See "In der Bundesacht," *Kardinalfragen*, "Erste Schritt: Denunziation," pp. 51-52, as well as Rudolf's deposition respecting the charges against him, in which he

relates how he tried to maintain a reasoned exchange with Körber even when he knew that Körber was betraying him. For a full analysis of the seminar with its political and legal implications, see Karl Salm, "Der Justizskandal im Fall Thomas-Dehler-Stiftung: Der Rechtsverfall," in *Consiliarien* 1, 1995, pp. 13-49. This special issue of *Staatsbriefe* (Castel del Monte, Postfach 14 06 28, Munich 80456, Germany) is devoted to scholarly articles exclusively concerned with legal and other consequences of the sharpened anti-revisionist law, which was passed on October 28, 1994, and became law on December 1, 1994. With this major amendment, which sharpened the 1985 law, section §130 of the German criminal code now explicitly stipulates, in subsections 3 and 4, that anyone who in speech or writing publicly condones, denies or minimizes crimes committed under the leadership of the National Socialists, in such a way as to disturb public order, will be liable to a fine or up to five years imprisonment.

187. *Time*, April 24, 2000, p. 33. In response to a witness summons, Watt testified for Irving on day 7 in the Irving-Lipstadt trial. See also Watt's statement, from the *Evening Standard*, April 11, 2000, in the March-April 2000 *Journal of Historical Review*, pp. 52-53.

188. The prestige that David Irving enjoys (or has enjoyed) has contributed enormously to the "respectability" of revisionism. Important progress in this direction was the tribute made by former deportee Michel de Boüard to the objectivity of revisionist research. (See the interview he gave to *Ouest France*, translated in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1988, pp. 381-384.) From letters he wrote to Henri Roques shortly before his death, it is clear that he recognized the importance of the Leuchter Report. The fact that Roques obtained his doctorate on *The "Confessions" of Kurt Gerstein* from Nantes University (even though it was subsequently revoked) is highly significant. (See Roques' article, "From the Gerstein Affair to the Roques Affair," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1988, pp. 5-23.) For an appreciation of this thesis by an orthodox historian, see "British Historian Hugh Trevor-Roper on the Gerstein 'Confessions' and the Gas Chamber Question," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1993 (Vol. 13, No. 5), pp. 40f. The article contains a letter to Roques by Lord Dacre (Trevor-Roper). Although disagreeing with the revisionists on some essential points, he writes: "... I regard your thesis as entirely legitimate and very interesting." Another sign of progress is the tribute paid to revisionists by the respected German historian Ernst Nolte, and his uncompromising defense of their right to free speech. See "Ein Gesetz für das Aussergetzliche," *Frankfurter Algemeine Zeitung,* August 23, 1994, p. 7; "Ein historisches Recht Hitlers?," *Der Spiegel*, 40/1994, pp. 83-103; "Throwing Off Germany's Imposed History: A Conversation with Professor Ernst Nolte," interview by Ian B. Warren, *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1994 (Vol. 14, No. 1), pp. 15-22; as well as, in the same *Journal* issue, pp. 37-41, a review by M. Weber of Nolte's 1994 book *Streitpunkte* ("Points of Contention"). Nolte refers to Holocaust revisionists as "radical revisionists," and chapter 15 of *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit* (pp. 304-319) is devoted to them. It is clear that he at least takes them seriously, even if rejecting their conclusions. Joel S. A. Hayward's thesis, *The Fate of Jews in German Hands: An Historical Enquiry Into the Development and Significance of Holocaust Revisionism,* was awarded an MA with distinction by Christchurch University, New Zealand, and was a breakthrough regarding recognition by establishment institutions. Hayward recently repudiated his thesis, even requesting the university to withdraw it from its library. (See "Varsity leader defends historian," *New Zealand Herald*, April 15-16, 2000, and, "Revisionist Master's Thesis Under Fire, May-June 2000 *Journal*, pp. 21-23). The publication of Roger Garaudy's *Les Mythes fondateurs de la politique israelienne* (La Vieille Taupe, 1995, Samiszdat, 1996), and the support given him by the Abbé Pierre must also be seen as signs of progress, even though Garaudy hardly acknowledges the work done by revisionist pioneers. See "French Study of Israel's 'Founding Myths' Provokes Furious Attack," *The Journal of Historical Review*, March-April 1996 (Vol. 16, No. 2), pp. 35-36, and "On the Garaudy/Abbé Pierre Affair," by R. Faurisson, in the July-August 1996 *Journal* (Vol. 16, No. 4), pp. 26-28. For the impact of Garaudy's trial on the Arab world, see the English editions of the semi-official Egyptian weekly *Al-Ahram,* Jan. 22 and 29, 1998. An expanded edition of Garaudy's book, *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, with an introduction by Theodore O'Keefe, was published by the IHR in the first half of 2000. Grudging acknowledgement occasionally comes from establishment circles. The prestigious French weekly *L'Express* has admitted that everything about the Auschwitz I "gas chamber" is phony. (See "Auschwitz: la mémoire du mal," by Eric Conan, Jan. 26, 1995, pp. 30-49, intl. edition; "Major French Magazine Acknowledges Auschwitz Gas Chamber Fraud," Jan.-Feb. 1995 *Journal*, pp. 23-24.) The Swiss daily paper *Le Nouveau Quotidien* had two revealing articles by the historian J. Baynac ("Comment les historiens délèguent à la justice la tâche de faire taire les révisionnistes" ("How historians leave to justice the task of putting a stop to the revisionists"), Sept. 2, 1996, p. 16, and "Faute de documents probants sur les chambres à gaz, les historiens esquivent le débat" ("Because of a lack of convincing documents for the gas chambers, historians dodge the debate"), Sept. 3, 1996, p. 16. These articles (kindly sent to me by R. Faurisson) point out that traditional historiography is seriously flawed when it concerns the "Nazi gas chambers." In the second article Baynac writes that it may be necessary "to prove" that their "non-existence is impossible"! See R. Faurisson, "An Orthodox Historian Finally Acknowl-

edges: There is No Evidence for Nazi Gas Chambers," July-August 1998 *Journal*, pp. 24-28. The Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH), an organization headed by Bradley R. Smith, is online at http://www.codoh.com. It has placed numerous advertisements in college newspapers, and reaches out to many people, giving them an idea of revisionist arguments. It would be interesting to know something about the effect these advertisements are having. Have students begun to cite revisionist sources? Are some instructors now encouraging debate? Partial breakthroughs to a scholarly open debate on the Holocaust can be seen from two articles in the May-June 1994 *Journal of Historical Review* (pp. 16-20): "'60 Minutes' Takes Aim at Holocaust Revisionism" and "Smith and Cole Appear in 'Donahue' Show in Major Media Breakthrough for Revisionism."

189. "Rudolf's 'Mystery Speaker' Statement," read out at the Twelfth IHR Conference, Sept. 3-5, 1994. *The Journal of Historical Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1994 (Vol. 14, No. 6), p. 15.

Corrections

"Treblinka Ground Radar Examination Finds No Trace of Mass Graves," in the May-June 2000 *Journal*, p. 20, contains an error. Richard Krege, whose team used a sophisticated Ground Penetration Radar (GPR) device to examine the site of the wartime Treblinka II camp, explains that he and his team scanned only the eastern corner of the camp site, and a small area near the monument there, and not, as reported, "the entire Treblinka II site." The examined areas, Krege further relates, were the alleged "mass grave" areas, according to reminiscences of camp survivors.

In the May-June 2000 *Journal* (issue 19/3), there is a mistake in the text of the 13th IHR Conference keynote address. The federal government agency mentioned on page 13, second column, in the first sentence of the second paragraph, is the United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

OUTRAGEOUS OPINION, TERRIFYING FACT, BRACING REALISM, FROM GARET GARRETT'S

AMERICA'S ROAD FROM SELF-RULE TO SERVITUDE

BURDEN of EMPIRE

THE LEGACY OF THE ROOSEVELT-TRUMAN REVOLUTION

Garet Garrett

Introduction by Theodore J. O'Keefe

Includes these timeless essays:
The Revolution Was
Ex America
The Rise of Empire

BURDEN of EMPIRE

"There is no comfort in history for those who put their faith in forms; who think there is safeguard in words inscribed on parchment, preserved in a glass case, preduced in facsimile and hauled to and fro on a Freedom Train."

"A government that had been supported by the people and so controlled by the people became one that supported the people and so controlled them. Much of it is irreversible."

"We have crossed the boundary that lies between Republic and Empire."

"Garrett's three trenchant brochures are indispensable to anybody who wishes to understand 'the strange death of liberal America' and desires to do something to check these dolorous and fateful trends in our political and economic life." — **Professor Harry Elmer Barnes,** historian.

"His keen perception and his forceful direct language are unsurpassed by any author." — **Professor Ludwig von Mises,** economist.

"This triad is must material for those who would be informed of the past, aware of the present, and concerned about the future." — **State Senator Jack B. Tenney,** California.

"The most radical view of the New Deal was that of libertarian essayist and novelist Garet Garrett ..." — **Professor Murray Rothbard.**

BURDEN of EMPIRE by Garet Garrett

Quality Softcover • 184 pages • $5.49 plus shipping and tax (#0198)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Letters

'Retail Politics'

Recently I gave a batch of copies of Roger Garaudy's *Founding Myths of Modern Israel* to a friend, who has been passing them around. He gave one to an old friend, a retired Catholic priest who, as a young man, had been deeply impressed with Garaudy's views on Marxism and Catholicism. This priest's doctoral dissertation has been based on Garaudy's writing. After reading a few chapters of *Founding Myths*, he concluded that Garaudy is right in his analysis of the Holocaust and its relationship with Zionism.

This story alone makes me feel justified in having purchased a box of Garaudy's book for distribution. Tip O'Neill, I believe, called this "retail politics."

J. S.
Seattle
[by e-mail]

Only Hard Facts Will Win

In the struggle for a truthful view of history, the only thing that will win out against the prevailing tyranny is hard facts. Revisionists are simply not in any position to win the PR war, because they don't have the media resources. We have to settle for what's doable. Facts are do-able.

In my view, the most effective strategy in the long run is to quietly carry out research work and then publish the findings, including on the Internet. There is no way revisionists can hope to prevail in battle against adversaries who have vastly greater political and media resources. So there's no point in squandering money and time in a manifestly unequal fight.

Hard facts do not come free, of course. Unearthing and publicizing them takes perseverance and a lot of time, money and effort. And even then, it's not at all clear that most people have the ability to distinguish between facts and propaganda, or even care to.

A. E.
Santa Fe Springs, Calif.

Long-Time Stoddard Reader

I read with interest Ted O'Keefe's review of the book by Lothrop Stoddard, *Into the Darkness* (March-April 2000 *Journal*, pp. 69-70).

It was about 1931, when I was a *Gymnasium* student, that I first encountered Stoddard through a booklet of excerpts from his book *The Revolt Against Civilization*. Later, with help of friends in America, I obtained a copy of the book itself, as well as another work, *Racial Realities*, by Madison Grant, who also wrote *The Passing of the Great Race*. With these books I began my study of the race question.

Georg Franz-Willing
Überlingen, Germany
[JHR Editorial Advisory Comm.]

Courage and Intellectual Power

Congratulations on the Jan.-Feb. 2000 *Journal*, one of the best I've seen. Robert Faurisson's recap of Holocaust revisionism is really outstanding. Also, the writings by Kevin MacDonald and Joseph Sobran are invaluable. Keep on publishing their stuff! I do not cease to marvel at the utter courage and intellectual power with which revisionists face the Molochracy.

E. R.
Richmond, Virginia

History and Propaganda

In his article, "For a Balanced History of the American Indian" (March-April 1999 *Journal*), Zoltán Bruckner suggests that *The True History of the Conquest of New Spain* by Bernal Díaz del Castillo is a biased work of only limited reliability. I disagree. In my opinion, *The True History* must be considered the most basic and authentic work for any examination of Cortes' expedition against the Aztecs. Harry Elmer Barnes did not hesitate to call del Castillo "a competent historian." *The True History*, wrote Barnes, is "not only a graphic account of the actual conquest, but rich in acute observations concerning the new world and its inhabitants." For the highly respected Mexican historian Carltos Pereyra, *The True History* "is the history book par excellence, the only history book of that period that deserves to live; it is history in an etymological sense, the testimony of the facts."

Friar Bartolomé de Las Casas, on the other hand, is a very matter. According to Lewis Hanke, Las Casas' "Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indians" marked "the beginnings of propaganda in our epoch." For Dale Van Every, it was "the most flagrant and successful propaganda feat of all time." From it came the figure of some 20 million Indians killed by the Castilians during the conquest. Las Casas accused the Spanish of killing more than three million on the island of Hispaniola alone, an area that could not have supported, with a pre-Colombian economy, any approximation of that number.

Philip Wayne Powell is right on the mark in writing — in *Tree of Hate* — that the bitter blasts of Las Casas began to spread in Europe precisely during the period of 1560-90 when the British were beginning to challenge Iberian monopolies in the New World, and the Dutch and English were embarking on long periods of conflict with Spain. "The harsh coloring of the Las Casas indict-

ment of Spaniards," says Prof. Powell, "was made to order for propaganda designed to show that the Spaniards, because of cruelties and greed, were unfit to retain title to New World territories."

The common belief that Spain's conquest in America was characterized by uniquely systematic cruelty, rapaciousness, greed and general depravity is simply not borne out by the evidence. Prof. Powell puts it more bluntly: "There is nothing in all Spanish history to prove that Spaniards, then or now, are characteristically more cruel, more greedy, or more depraved than other peoples. I do not believe that any reputable scholar, free of racial and religious prejudices, would contradict that statement."

J. K.
Overland Park, Kansas

Historical Understanding

Thank you for your web site and all the work you've done on your publications. Yours is by far the most interesting site I have visited in the last several years.

While we are taught that Hitler and Third Reich Germany's ruling elite were repressive thugs and murderers, almost nothing is said about the freedom and prosperity that ordinary Germans enjoyed, nor, indeed, about the Jews who continued to live and prosper, at least for several years, after Hitler's assumption of power.

It is clear from Germany's conduct of the war that neither Hitler nor the German High Command had any intention of fighting a global conflict, much less any interest in global domination. The historical record clearly shows that the three major Axis powers — Germany, Italy and Japan — were regional powers with limited objectives, which, however, conflicted with the only truly global powers at the time — the United States and Great Britain. The conduct of the US and Britain also clearly shows that it was these two, and not the Axis powers, nor indeed even the Soviet Union, that sought, at least initially, a globalization of the conflict.

It was the Allied governments that globalized the conflict, obliterated entire cities in a single night, incinerated hundreds of thousands of people in Hamburg, Dresden, Tokyo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, sought to obliterate the Axis ideology, and today criminalize challenges to their "official" history.

In the wake of the defeat of Third Reich Germany, it was necessary to demonize National Socialism because such an ideology posed, and still poses, a danger for the prevailing powers. A true understanding of history, and notably an understanding of Hitler, Nazism and the root causes of the Second World War, threaten the existing power structure.

T. E.
[by e-mail]

Inviolate 'Truth'

Please accept my congratulations on your website. Ever since an unfortunate personal experience while in elementary school, I have been suspicious of the "accepted history" of the victors of World War II. I am all the more so because this "truth" is presented as inviolate.

You do a great service merely by voicing reasoned dissent. I am grateful that your views and research are available to the public.

L. A. E.
[by e-mail]

An Ignored Holocaust

It was in May 1996, after reading an article in the *San Francisco Examiner* entitled "An Ignored Holocaust Killed 2 Million Germans," that I started graduate school. The complicity of the American and British governments in the brutal expulsions of more than twelve million Germans in the aftermath of World War II is seldom talked about. The victorious powers that ran the Nuremberg trials did not permit any treatment of the subject. Nor, by the way, has anyone ever been brought to justice for the infamous 1940 murder of thousands of Polish officers in the Katyn forest.

C. A. L.
California
[by e-mail]

Privileged Victimhood

Whenever I hear or see too many "Holocaust" stories within too short a time period, my system seems to overload, and I get hit with a rush of what I call "Holocaust anxiety." Over the years, my threshold of tolerance for this seems to be lessening, and now I sometimes find myself feeling numb, wondering when on earth this campaign of victimological promotion will ever subside. Sometimes I even raise my hands and lament "Not again!"

Our media never seems to miss an opportunity to promote Holocaust imagery, eager to make sure that no other tragedy, past or present, is ever permitted to challenge the primacy of Jewish victimology. Jews seem determined to protect at all costs their privileged status as the champion victims, and with it the profitable sympathy of non-Jews. Jewish leaders seem anxious whenever non-Jews are inclined to show too much sympathy for other victims — above all, of course, Palestinians. Instead, they desperately want to keep our pity focused on their "unique" victimhood. They encourage concern for other genocides only to the extent that it refocuses attention on Jewish suffering.

S. D.
Canada
[by e-mail]

Public Relations Setback

David Irving's defeat in his much-publicized London libel suit [reported in the March-April 2000 *Journal*] was not merely a disaster for him, but a severe public relations defeat for Holocaust revisionism and, indeed, for truthful history in general. He took on a huge task and, to use his

words, ended up being covered with a bucket of slime. But it's not a fatal setback, and I'm sure that revisionism will recover.

R. R.
Tyne-Wear, England

Everything Proven

You are so wrong. All the Auschwitz atrocities are well-documented and proven beyond doubt. There was no need for eyewitnesses because the Allied forces proved everything with photographs and film footage. At any rate, why would Jews or anyone lie or exaggerate? The dead cannot be brought back to life. Anyway, the Jews not only survived, but have prospered, big time, into the 21st century. The Nazi efforts did not work. May you die of jealousy.

Anna S.
Canada
[by e-mail]

Taking Note

You and your colleagues deserve thanks for your tough fight against powerful interests. People are quietly taking note. I'm an example. I first came across your organization several years ago when I was researching some related issues. Holocaust revisionism is pivotal because, in overcoming fabrication with truth, it raises important questions in the mind of the broad public.

C. D.
[by e-mail]

Skeptical Baby Boomer

Thanks for your courageous effort to present an alternative interpretation of 20th century history, in spite of the intense international pressures that face anyone who dissents from the "facts" that were supposedly established at Nuremberg.

I am a "baby boomer," born in the aftermath of World War II. For many years I accepted unquestioningly the conventional

Holocaust story. But after examining material on your site and others, and especially after noting the hysterically out-of-proportion reaction by those who object to any questioning of the "Holocaust," I have come to conclude that a huge lie has been presented as truth.

N. R.
[by e-mail]

A Great Disservice

I was flabbergasted reading the short item by Oswald Spengler, "The Great Challenge Facing the West," in the July-August 2000 *Journal* (p. 49). Publishing it is a great disservice to those of us who defend our Western heritage and values against the forces of global enslavement. When Spengler wrote that [1931], the situation was very different — and seemingly not as desperate — as it is today. If, as he believed, our defeat is "already" inevitable and there is no "way out," why not simply give up? Apart from this "lapsus," your work is admirable and very much appreciated.

G. L.
Bolzano, Italy

No Obsession With the Past

By attempting to present the truth regarding World War II and its aftermath, you are making a real contribution. I enjoy your *Journal*. Keep up the excellent work.

At the same time, we should not become obsessed with events that are now more than half a century in the past. Doing so keeps us from dealing with today's challenges. We must become politically involved. To do that effectively, we must truly understand the past, but not become mired in it.

C. D.
Tulsa, Okla.

A Truer Picture

Congratulations on your excellent *Journal* and the various IHR publications, which encourage freer and more informed discussion of various aspects of the so-called Holocaust. Thanks to your publications, along with such works as the recently-issued collection *Dissecting the Holocaust*, a truer picture is managing to seep through the filters of official censorship, permitting a more accurate understanding of those years.

N. M.
Ireland
[by e-mail]

Holding the Fort

As I have for years, I'm still "holding the fort," expending much time and psychic energy sparring with people on the Internet. Why do I do it? Perhaps, even at the age of 72, there's still a bit of schoolboy in my makeup. When some pathetic twerp who thinks he's real clever hurls a "challenge," I feel I must reply lest I be accused of deserting the "field of honor." And it's always fun to feel that I've demolished an adversary's arguments. But they never seem to stay demolished.

Of all those on our side who debate on the Internet, I am surely the most hated. There is good reason for this. It is sad to have to admit that many of those on our side are enraged semi-literates who use foul language, not to occasionally salt the discourse, but as the principal currency of their discourse. The Holocaustniks have no difficulty dismissing them as losers, bigots, neo-Nazis, trailer park trash, and so forth.

But in me they find a very different proposition: a verbal opponent who expresses himself grammatically and logically, and who is Jewish in the bargain.

Sometimes I fall into a fit of despair. Why is it that, with all the facts on our side, we have failed to make a dent in the popular consciousness? Only recently have I come to realize just what an iron grip the mainstream media holds on the American mind.

R. P.
Arvada, Col.

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space. Write: Editor, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA, or e-mail us at editor@ihr.org

FIRST SUPPRESSED, THEN FORGOTTEN FOR SIXTY YEARS

Lothrop Stoddard's Sympathetic Report from Hitler's Wartime Reich



Twentieth-century America's most perceptive, influential, and prophetic writer on race — Lothrop Stoddard — spent four months in late 1939-early 1940 covering National Socialist Germany, as its leaders and its people girded for total war. Stoddard criss-crossed the Third Reich to observe nearly every aspect of its political, social, economic, and military life, and he talked with men and women from all walks of life, from Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, and Joseph Goebbels to taxi drivers and chambermaids.

The result — *Into the Darkness* — is not only a classic of World War II reportage, but a unique evaluation of Germany's National Socialist experiment. For Stoddard was no ordinary journalist. A Harvard Ph.D in history, the author of *The Rising Tide of Color* and other works that played a key role in the enactment of America's 1924 immigration act, fluent in German and deeply versed in European politics and culture, Stoddard brought to *Into the Darkness* a sophistication and a sympathy impossible for William Shirer and a myriad of other journalistic hacks.

To be sure, the New England Yankee Stoddard was no supporter of the Hitler dictatorship, but he was deeply interested in National Socialist policies, above all in the social and the racial sphere. Reading *Into the Darkness* brings you to hearings before a German eugenics court, to an ancestral farm in Westphalia, to the headquarters of the National Labor Service, to German markets, factories, medical clinics, and welfare offices, as keenly observed and analyzed by Stoddard. You'll read, too, of Stoddard's conversations with German policy makers in all fields: Hans F. K. Günther and Fritz Lenz on race and eugenics; Walther Darré on agriculture; Robert Ley on labor; Gertrud Scholz-Klink on women in the Third Reich; General Alexander Löhr on the Luftwaffe's Polish campaign, as well as Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels and many other leaders. And you'll travel with Stoddard to Slovakia, where he interviews Monsignor Tiso, the national leader later put to death by the Communists, and to Hungary, where the Magyars, still at peace, gaze apprehensively at Soviet Russia.

Into the Darkness (so named from the mandatory air-defense blackout that Stoddard found so vexing) shines a torch of sanity and truth against the vituperation of all things National Socialist that has been practically obligatory for the past sixty years. Knowledgeable, urbane, skeptical, and above all fair, Stoddard's book is a unique, an indispensable historical document, a time capsule for truth, and a stimulating page-turner for everyone interested in the Third Reich and the German people.

Into The Darkness: An Uncensored Report from Inside the Third Reich at War

Quality softcover. 311 pages. New Introduction. Index. (#0123)

$13.95 (shipping: $2.50 domestic, $3.50 foreign; CA sales tax: $1.08)

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

A Horrific, Suppressed Story

Revised, Updated Edition

"The events are vivid, the language is powerful, the conclusions appear just. The book should be read and become part of the all too gruesome document the world calls history."
– New York *Daily News*

In 1945 Poland's new Soviet-dominated government was actively recruiting Jews for its Office of State Security to carry out its own trademark brand of brutal "de-Nazification." The Office's agents raided German homes, rounding up some 200,000 men, women, children and infants – 99 percent of them non-combatant, innocent civilians. Incarcerated in cellars, prisons, and 1,255 concentration camps where typhus was rampant and torture was commonplace, the inmates subsisted on starvation rations. In this brief period, between 60,000 and 80,000 Germans perished at the hands of the Office.



An Eye for an Eye tells the little-known story of how Jewish victims of the Third Reich inflicted equally terrible suffering on innocent Germans. To unearth it, the author, a veteran journalist and war correspondent, spent seven years conducting research and interviews in Poland, Germany, Israel and the United States.

Author John Sack focuses on such figures as Shlomo Morel, a commandant who bragged: "What the Germans couldn't do in five years at Auschwitz, I've done in five months at Schwientochlowitz."

Not for 60 years has a book been so diligently (and, in the end, unsuccessfully) suppressed as *An Eye for an Eye*. One major newspaper, one major magazine, and three major publishers paid $40,000 for it but were scared off. One printed 6,000 copies, then pulped them. Two dozen publishers read *An Eye for an Eye* and praised it. "Shocking," "Startling," "Astonishing," "Mesmerizing," "Extraordinary," they wrote to the author, but all two dozen rejected it.

When it was finally published by Basic Books, it "sparked a furious controversy" *(Newsweek)*. And while it became a best-seller in Europe, it was so shunned in America that it also became, in the words of *New York* magazine, "The Book They Dare Not Review."

Since then, both *60 Minutes* and *The New York Times* have corroborated Sack's riveting expose of atrocities by vengeful Jews against German civilians in Communist-ruled Poland.

Completely revised and updated, this fourth edition includes 74 pages of reference citations and other source notes.

An Eye for an Eye

The Story of Jews Who Sought Revenge for the Holocaust

by John Sack

Quality softcover. 280 pages. Revised, updated fourth edition. Photos. Source notes. Index. (#0333)
$12.95 plus $2.00 shipping ($3.00 foreign; California orders add $1.00 sales tax)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA